

**This is an electronic reprint of the original article.
This reprint *may differ* from the original in pagination and typographic detail.**

Author(s): Kujawinski, Jakub

Title: Commenting on Historical Writings in Medieval Latin Europe : A Reconnaissance

Year: 2015

Version:

Please cite the original version:

Kujawinski, J. (2015). Commenting on Historical Writings in Medieval Latin Europe : A Reconnaissance. *Acta Poloniae Historica*, 112, 159-200.
<https://doi.org/10.12775/APH.2015.112.06>

All material supplied via JYX is protected by copyright and other intellectual property rights, and duplication or sale of all or part of any of the repository collections is not permitted, except that material may be duplicated by you for your research use or educational purposes in electronic or print form. You must obtain permission for any other use. Electronic or print copies may not be offered, whether for sale or otherwise to anyone who is not an authorised user.



Acta Poloniae Historica
112, 2015
PL ISSN 0001-6892

Jakub Kujawiński

Institute of History, Adam Mickiewicz University, Poznań
Department of Languages, University of Jyväskylä

COMMENTING ON HISTORICAL WRITINGS IN MEDIEVAL LATIN RUROPE: A RECONNAISSANCE*

Abstract

Modern scholarship seems to undervalue medieval commentaries on historical writings. This article intends to bring this phenomenon to scholars' attention by providing a preliminary overview of the forms and subjects of such commentaries. It examines various types of evidence including not only a few commentaries proper (Nicolas Trevet's on Livy and John of Dąbrówka's on Vincent of Cracow), but also different apparatus consisting of more or less systematic interlinear and marginal glosses and commentary-like additions to vernacular translations, mostly of Italian and French origin. It begins by considering various consultation-related signs and annotations, such as cross-references. Then, it studies the text-like features of sets of glosses (ascertained authorship and manuscript tradition) and briefly discusses some of their patterns of display as found in single manuscripts. Turning to the contents of commentaries, the article first touches upon introductions to the authors (*accessus*) and comments on the historians' lives and the history of their writings. The article then discusses comments on different levels of meaning: first, explanations of grammatical forms, figures of speech, semantics of single words and entire fragments, then, different ways of exploring, or imposing, the inner senses of historical narration, mostly of an ethical nature. Finally, the text argues that among the different ways of expounding an historical account, comments on subject matter are especially worthy of attention from the perspective

* The idea of this work and the core of the source corpus date back to research on Southern Italian historical manuscripts conducted during my postdoctoral fellowship (*assegno di ricerca*) at Sapienza Università di Roma in 2010–12. It was possible to carry out this research, while lecturing at Adam Mickiewicz University in Poznań (2012–14), thanks to the “Scholarship for distinguished young scholars” granted by the Polish Ministry of Research and Higher Education. The first results were presented in 2013 in Warsaw and Rome. The final version of the article was prepared in 2015 within the project “Transmission of Knowledge in the Late Middle Ages and the Renaissance” financed by the Academy of Finland and the University of Jyväskylä, no. 267518 (2013–17). I wish to express my deep gratitude to Outi Merisalo for her very helpful comments on a draft and to Emanuel da Silva for language revision.

of the history of historical scholarship. Explanations of technical terms and place names often led to erudite digressions and revealed tensions between continuity and change. Expounding historical contents of entire fragments might include some elements of source criticism or tend towards a new historical synthesis. Medieval commentators were also able to read historical information beyond the factual account, often introducing subjects proper to antiquarian writings.

Keywords: medieval historiography, medieval commentaries, glosses, antiquarism, medieval vernacular translations, history of scholarship

I

A century has elapsed since Benedetto Croce asserted that “in a history of historiography as such, historical writings cannot be looked upon ... as forms of art”, since the object of history of historiography “is the *development of historiographical thought*” (emphasis in the original).¹ Since then, scholarship on past historiography has made considerable progress and explored a variety of approaches. As far as the medieval period is concerned, research on single chronicles has been integrated with studies on the social and political functions of historical writings, on ideas that conditioned interpretations of past events, and on the narrative patterns that modelled their representation. Moreover, investigations into manuscript tradition have surpassed the usual ecdotic purposes and revealed the great potential for the study of patronage and the audience, the reception and re-writing of histories.² Yet, there is an aspect of medieval readership of historical writings which has attracted relatively little attention to date, namely commenting on histories.

¹ Benedetto Croce, *Theory and History of Historiography* (London, 1921), 166 and 168. The English translation by Douglas Ainslie is from the second Italian edition of *Teoria e storia della storiografia* (Bari, 1920); the work was first published in German as *Zur Theorie und Geschichte der Historiographie*, trans. Enrico Pizzo (Tübingen, 1915), the passages under consideration are on pp. 124 and 126.

² See the recent discussion on the state of art in the history of medieval historiography by Justin Lake, ‘Current Approaches to Medieval Historiography’, *History Compass*, xiii, 3 (2015), 89–109; cf. Jakub Kujawiński, ‘Verso un quadro più completo della produzione storiografica del Mezzogiorno angioino. Presentazione del progetto “Mare Historiarum” e alcune considerazioni sul manoscritto BAV, Vat. lat. 1860’, in Giancarlo Alfano *et al.* (eds.), *Boccaccio e Napoli. Nuovi materiali per la storia culturale di Napoli nel Trecento* (Firenze, 2014, publ. 2015), 387–403: 388–93.

The medieval commentary tradition is strictly related to teaching.³ It is not surprising, therefore, that the generally accepted statement about a secondary or auxiliary status of ‘history’ at medieval schools and universities is normally combined with the conviction that historical writings were rarely commented upon during the Middle Ages.⁴ As a matter of fact, both assumptions should be revisited. It is not the purpose of my paper, however, to reconsider the use of histories in medieval teaching, but rather to attempt an assessment of the scale and forms of medieval commenting on historical writings, which may have occurred either within or outside classes, and which can offer an interesting insight into the ways that historical materials were approached.

The two still unsurpassed syntheses of medieval historiography by Beryl Smalley and Bernard Guenée skim over this phenomenon, with only incidental mentions of single commentaries, manuscripts with glosses or the practice as such.⁵ Thus, to my knowledge, medieval commenting on historical writings has never emerged as a subject of research in its own right. It has mainly been considered as either an aspect of a wider phenomenon of commenting on the Classics (and then confined to medieval commentaries on ancient historians) or within studies of the medieval reception of single historical works, both classical and post-classical.⁶ The distinction between *antiqui* and *moderni* is of some importance to the

³ Alastair J. Minnis, Alexander B. Scott, and David Wallance (eds.), *Medieval Literary Theory and Criticism c. 1100–c. 1375: The Commentary-Tradition* (Oxford, 1988), 1; Louis Holtz, ‘Glosse e commenti’, in Guglielmo Cavallo, Claudio Leonardi and Ernesto Menestò (eds.), *Lo spazio letterario del Medioevo. 1. Il Medioevo latino, iii: La ricezione del testo* (Roma, 1995), 59–111, here: 60–61, 69.

⁴ Holtz, ‘Glosse e commenti’, 73. On the place history occupied in school curricula and, more generally speaking, in the medieval systems of knowledge, see Beryl Smalley, *Historians in the Middle Ages* (London, 1974), 11–12, Bernard Guenée, *Histoire et culture historique dans l’occident médiéval* (Paris, 1980, quoted from the reprint, Paris, 2011), 25–38, and Otto Mazal, *Geschichte der abendländischen Wissenschaft des Mittelalters*, 2 vols. (Graz, 2006), i, 570, 578 f.

⁵ Smalley, *Historians in the Middle Ages*, 20 (il. 9), 174, 191–2; Guenée, *Histoire et culture historique*, 28, 37, 67, 110, 231 f., 256 f., 292 f.

⁶ These two categories do not exhaust the range of studies which may possibly reveal an interest in commentaries on historians. To mention but one example, precious information is gained from studies on single centres of book production, as illustrated by Richard M. Pollard’s research on Nonantola, “Libri di scuola spirituale”. Manuscripts and Marginalia at the Monastery of Nonantola’, in: Lucio Del Corso and Oronzo Pecere (eds.), *Libri di scuola e pratiche didattiche. Dall’Antichità*

present analysis. Indeed, some ancient historical writings became grammar and rhetoric textbooks and were subsequently provided with introductions and more or less systematic glosses and commentaries. This is the case of *Bellum Catilinae* and *Bellum Iugurthinum* by Sallust and of *Pharsalia* by Lucan. Studies of commentaries on the Classics have a long tradition. The on-going catalogue founded by Paul Oskar Kristeller yields precious insight into the state of art in this field and is a guide to commentaries on classical historians.⁷ It includes twenty-one commentaries on one or both of Sallust's monographs, written before the end of the fifteenth century (plus many glossed manuscripts and introductions),⁸ but only one commentary on the *Corpus Caesarianum* (plus a few manuscripts containing non-systematic glosses).⁹ Livy is also said to have received only one medieval commentary, namely the *Expositio* on the First and Third Decades commissioned by Pope John XXII to Nicolas Trevet, which was probably written by 1319.¹⁰ However, in this case, too, several

al Rinascimento. Atti del Convegno Internazionale di Studi, Cassino, 7–10 maggio 2008 (Cassino, 2010), 331–408.

⁷ *Catalogus Translationum et Commentariorum. Mediaeval and Renaissance Latin Translations and Commentaries* [hereinafter: CTC], i–ii, ed. Paul O. Kristeller; iii–vi, ed. F. Edward Kranz; vii–ix, ed. Virginia Brown (Washington D.C., 1961–2011), x, ed. Greti Dinkova-Bruun (Toronto, 2014).

⁸ Patricia J. Osmond and Robert W. Ulery, Jr., 'Sallustius Crispus, Gaius', in CTC, viii (2003), 183–326: 225–45, 284–94, cf. 193 f.; cf. Beryl Smalley, 'Sallust in the Middle Ages', in Robert R. Bolgar (ed.), *Classical Influences on European Culture, A. D. 500–1500* (Cambridge, 1971), 165–75, here: 169 f.

⁹ Virginia Brown, 'Caesar, Gaius Julius', in CTC, iii (1976), 87–139, here: 102, cf. 89, 93.

¹⁰ Alexander H. McDonald, 'Titus Livius', in CTC, ii (1971), 331–48, here: 340–2; and *idem*, 'Titus Livius. Addenda et corrigenda', in CTC, iii (1976), 445–9. This is perhaps the best known example of a medieval commentary on an historical text, even though it is still unedited. For the author and his work, see: Ruth J. Dean, 'The Earliest Known Commentary on Livy, *Medievalia and Humanistica*, iii (1945), 86–98; *eadem*, 'Corrigenda', *Medievalia and Humanistica*, iv (1946), 110; Beryl Smalley, *English Friars and Antiquity in the Early Fourteenth Century* (Oxford, 1960), 58–65, 88–92. An edition of a fragment, see Nikolaus Trevet, 'Apparatus libri Titi Livi I.1–7.3', in *Titus Livius, Ab Urbe condita I, 1–9. Ein mittellateinischer Kommentar und sechs romanische Übersetzungen und Kürzungen aus dem Mittelalter*, ed. Curt J. Wittlin (Tübingen, 1970), 2–27. Giuliana Crevatin has recently approached this commentary in a series of articles, of which the latest is 'Dalle *fabulae* alle *historiae*: Nicola Trevet espone le Decadi liviane', in Marcello Ciccuto, Giuliana Crevatin, and Enrico Fenzi (eds.), *Reliquiarum servator*.

other *scribes and scholars* have provided more or less systematic glosses on the *Ab Urbe condita*.¹¹ A survey of Lucan is still missing from the *Catalogus*, but Birger Munk Olsen's research on the reception of the Classics in the High Middle Ages helps address this gap: there are reportedly seven commentaries or systematic glosses prior to the end of the twelfth century, as well as twenty-one introductions (*accessus*), which may have circulated separately from the commentaries.¹² To this list, I can add at least three readers from the fourteenth and beginning of the fifteenth centuries who provided their exemplars of Lucan with glosses.¹³

It is much more difficult to assess how many post-classical historical writings have received any kind of apparatus. An exceptional example might be the commentary on the early thirteenth-century *Chronica Polonorum* of Vincent, bishop of Cracow, written by John of Dąbrówka by 1436, which is mentioned by both Smalley (without naming the commentator) and Guenée.¹⁴ In what follows, I shall present evidence that Vincent's was not the only medieval chronicle to have been commented on. What makes this case unusual is

Il manoscritto Parigino latino 5690 e la storia di Roma nel Livio dei Colonna e di Francesco Petrarca (Pisa, 2012), 59–116, followed by the edition of the fragments of Trevet's commentary taken over by Landolfo Colonna in the apparatus in his exemplar of Livy: 'Expositio Titi Livii', in *ibidem*, 117–73.

¹¹ The exemplar of Livy most intensively glossed from the previous centuries is the copy of the First Decade (today Firenze, Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana, Plut. 63, 19), made in Verona under bishop Ratherius (d. 974); some glosses, however, derive from the late antique exemplar, see Giuseppe Billanovich, 'Dal Livio di Raterio (Laur. 63, 19) al Livio di Petrarca (B.M., Harl. 2493)', *Italia Medioevale e Umanistica*, ii (1959), 103–78: 112–15. Some other cases will be mentioned below.

¹² Birger Munk Olsen, *L'étude des auteurs classiques latins aux XIe et XIIe siècles*, iv, 1: *La réception de la littérature classique. Travaux philologiques* (Paris, 2009), 83–7.

¹³ These are: Benvenuto da Imola (Luca Carlo Rossi, 'Benvenuto da Imola lettore di Lucano', in Pantaleo Palmieri and Carlo Paolazzi [eds.], *Benvenuto da Imola lettore degli antichi e dei moderni. Atti del Convegno Internazionale, Imola, 26–27 maggio 1989* [Ravenna, 1991], 165–203); Andrea da Goito (the commentary handed down by the MS Praha, Národní knihovna České republiky, IV C 5, fols. 1r–137r, has recently been attributed to this author by Marco Petoletti, 'Due nuovi codici di Zanobi da Strada', *Medioevo e Rinascimento* xxvi, n.s., 23 [2012], 37, note 1); and Giacomo da Sora (MS Napoli, Biblioteca Nazionale Vittorio Emanuele III, IV. E. 28, dated at the year 1406).

¹⁴ Smalley, *Historians in the Middle Ages*, 174; Guenée, *Histoire et culture historique*, 37.

the fact that a 'modern' chronicle was provided with a systematic *expositio*. The academic context of the commentary is rare as well: it was finished soon after John, then master at the Academy of Cracow, left the chair in grammar and rhetoric to assume the chair in Aristotelian philosophy, where he began by lecturing on the *Politics*. It is highly probable that both Vincent's chronicle and John's commentary were integrated into those classes, and it is proven that, by John's initiative, the chronicle was officially included among rhetoric textbooks in 1449.¹⁵

Not until a global investigation has been conducted into medieval manuscripts of historical content, will it be possible to assess the full dimensions of the practice of commenting on historical writings. The lack of such a survey is the first and most important limitation on any attempt at describing the phenomenon under consideration.

Since my interest here is the practice of commenting, there is no reason to apply a restrictive definition and limit the perspective to commentaries proper, that is to say elaborate *expositiones* that cover a whole text and are often copied separately from the commented *opus*. In fact, few historical writings have commentary of this kind. Instead, I propose a broader view of commentaries that includes more or less systematic glosses, and even short annotations scattered in the margins of single historical manuscripts, as well as vernacular translations of historical writings which often convey additions that

¹⁵ The commentary was remarkably successful: in addition to the author's draft, twenty-four manuscript copies dating from the fifteenth century are known. The text is available both in a critical edition, based on four fine copies, see Ioannes de Dąbrówka, *Commentum in Chronicam Polonorum magistri Vincentii dicti Kadłubek*, ed. Marian Zwiercan, collab. Anna Sophia Kozłowska and Michaele Rzepiela (MPH, S.N., xiv, Kraków, 2008), as well as by means of a digital reproduction of the autograph *brouillon* (today Warszawa, Biblioteka Narodowa, rkps 3002 III: <<http://polona.pl/item/264647/3/>> [Accessed: Aug. 1, 2015]). While a collective monograph, Andrzej Dąbrówka and Mikołaj Olszewski (eds.), *Komentarz Jana z Dąbrówki do „Kroniki biskupa Wincentego”*, and the article by Mikołaj Olszewski, 'History at the medieval university? Remarks on John of Dąbrówka's Commentary on Vincent Kadłubek's *Chronicle of Poles*' in *What is New in the New Universities? Learning in Central Europe in Later Middle Ages (1348–1500). Proceedings of the XVIII Annual Colloquium of the SIEPM* (I am grateful to the author for the opportunity of reading his unpublished work) are forthcoming, the work of Marian Zwiercan, *Komentarz Jana z Dąbrówki do Kroniki Mistrza Wincentego zwanego Kadłubkiem* (Wrocław, 1969) (Summary, 192–195), remains the most comprehensive reference on the *Commentum*.

resemble commentaries.¹⁶ In other words, I shall give precedence to the function, that of commenting, over the variety of forms and display patterns of medieval apparatus. Coincidentally, this functional approach aligns with the position of both Bernard of Utrecht and Conrad of Hirsau, who pointed to *dilucidatio* as the main aim of a commentator.¹⁷ Restricting my perspective to systematic and complete commentaries alone would also be unjustified, considering the remarkable fluidity and dynamism of commentary-type texts, namely the evolution from sets of glosses towards a continuous commentary, the atomization of continuous commentaries into glosses, or the migration of glosses into commented texts.¹⁸

Instead, the distinction between different forms and subjects of commentaries will serve to organize my presentation. What follows, therefore, is not a diachronic discussion of medieval commentaries on historical writings, as much more research is still required in order to characterize their development throughout the Middle Ages. The material under consideration here, however, has allowed me to recognize the various types, themes, and concerns of commentaries which will be discussed synchronously combining medieval evidence sometimes quite distant in time and space. This corpus requires a few words of introduction. It has emerged gradually during my studies on the historical culture of Angevin Southern Italy. As part of this, I have

¹⁶ For the latter group cf. remarks on the translation of Valerius Maximus by Simon de Hesdin (1375 before 1383) in Didier Lechat, 'Valère Maxime au miroir de Simon de Hesdin', in Laurence Bernard-Pradelle and Claire Lechevalier (eds.) *Traduire les Anciens en Europe du Quattrocento à la fin du XVIIIe siècle. D'une renaissance à une révolution?* (Paris, 2012), 31–43, here: 34, 38 f.

¹⁷ "Commentatores sunt qui breuia uel obscura aliorum scripta scripto dilucidant, dicti a comminiscendo" (Bernard of Utrecht, *Commentum in Theodulum*); "Commentatores sunt qui solent ex paucis multa cogitare et obscura dicta aliorum dilucidare" (Conrad of Hirsau, *Dialogus super auctores*), quoted from Munk Olsen, *L'étude des auteurs*, iv, 1, 6.

¹⁸ See Munk Olsen, *L'étude des auteurs*, iv, 1, 12, 14–15, 22; cf. Holtz, 'Glosse e commenti', 89–92. As regards historical writings see, e.g., Osmond and Ulery, 'Sallustius', 227, 230 on the Anonymus Bernensis and the Anonymus Monachensis A. The well-documented migrations between marginal glosses and autonomous commentaries sometimes lead to an unjustified assimilation of two somehow related but distinct phenomena of 'commentary' and 'marginalia', see Adolfo Tura, 'Essai sur les marginalia en tant que pratique et documents', in Danielle Jacquart and Charles Burnett (eds.), *Scientia in margine. Études sur les marginalia dans les manuscrits scientifiques du Moyen-Age à la Renaissance* (Genève, 2005), 261–387, here: 262–7.

investigated the manuscript miscellanies of classical and medieval historical writings containing abundant marginal glosses (Città del Vaticano, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana [henceforth BAV], Vat. lat. 1860¹⁹ and 5001²⁰), and the miscellany of French versions of five Latin chronicles and histories significantly amplified by an anonymous translator (Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France [henceforth BnF], fr. 688).²¹ Research into the manuscript tradition of these and other

¹⁹ The MS BAV, Vat. lat. 1860 contains the following works of Classical Antiquity: *Epitoma de Tito Livio* by Florus, *Vitae Caesarum* by Suetonius, *Epitoma rei militaris* by Vegetius, *Breviarium ab Urbe condita* by Eutropius, *Breviarium* by Festus, *Bellum Catilinae* and *Bellum Iugurthinum* by Sallust, *Ephemeris belli Troiani* by Dictys Cretensis, *Collectanea rerum memorabilium* by Solinus, *Epitoma historiarum Philippicarum* by Iustinus and Frontinus's *Strategemata*, as well as one medieval work, *Breviloquium de virtutibus antiquorum principum et philosophorum* by John of Wales (d. 1285). This miscellany was probably produced in stages and finished (illuminated) by the 1350s, perhaps on the commission of Zanobi da Strada, living in the Kingdom of Naples at that time. He is the author of most glosses. For more on both the codicological and textual features of the miscellany, see Kujawiński, 'Verso un quadro', 394–403; and Francesca Manzari, 'Un libro di storia miniato a Napoli (Vat. lat. 1860) e l'attività del Maestro del Salomone della Casanatense nella capitale angioina', in Alfano *et al.* (eds.), *Boccaccio e Napoli*, 405–16.

²⁰ The MS BAV, Vat. lat. 5001, datable to the first half of the fourteenth century and localised probably at Salerno, is a copy of an early medieval miscellany of historical writings, poems and charters composed in Southern Italy between the eighth and tenth centuries (now lost, it is however alluded to in the opening formula). Among the historical texts, anonymous *Chronicon Salernitanum* and Erchempert's *Ystoriola* are the most important. Several hands filled the manuscript's margins with numerous glosses in the fourteenth century. On the manuscript tradition of this apparatus (partly reproduced in some modern copies of the miscellany, which have made it possible to recover fragments lost in the archetype) and on the glosses by hand D, see Jakub Kujawiński, 'Commentare storici nell'Italia meridionale del XIV secolo. Intorno alle glosse presenti nel ms. BAV, Vat. lat. 5001', in Lidia Capo and Antonio Ciaralli (eds.), *Per ricordare Enzo. Atti della giornata di studio in memoria di Vincenzo Matera, Roma, 4 maggio 2012*, Università "La Sapienza" (Reti Medievali E-Book, 25, Firenze, 2015), 129–167.

²¹ The MS BnF, fr. 688 comprises French translations of the *Chronica maiora* by Isidore of Seville (615/616), the *Historia romana* and *Historia Langobardorum* by Paul the Deacon (end of the 8th century), *Historia Normannorum* by Amatus of Montecassino (end of the 11th century) and the anonymous *Deeds of Robert Guiscard* (known as *Historia Sicula*, first half of the 12th century). Both translations and the manuscript were produced during the second quarter of the fourteenth century. See Jakub Kujawiński, 'Alla ricerca del contesto del volgarizzamento della *Historia Normannorum* di Amato di Montecassino: il manoscritto francese 688 della

historical writings read in Southern Italy led me, in turn, to more pieces of commentary produced in different parts of Latin Europe, above all in Italy and France. I then integrated into this sample selected commentaries on ancient historians chosen from those registered in the *Catalogus* and in the studies by Birger Munk Olsen, as well as the aforementioned commentaries by Trevet and Dąbrówka. A corpus established in this way may be challenged for its seemingly casual design and thus for its relatively low representativeness. For these reasons, the present article is nothing more than a preliminary attempt at sketching, in broad terms, the phenomenon of commenting on historical writings in the Middle Ages and at assessing perspectives for further research.

II

Let me begin by briefly discussing the formal categorization of commentaries. In my opinion, even rudimentary expressions of *talking to a text* such as pointing hands, and monograms ‘Nota’ should not be excluded from this inquiry. Indeed, they are the first witnesses of discerning reading, a condition required, though not sufficient, for every act of commenting. Signs of this kind could influence the way that the same reader and others approached the text. They could serve as a ‘pro memoria’, bringing special attention to a selection of fragments and potentially leading to comments on them. This potential may be illustrated by the MS BAV, Vat. lat. 5001. The first occurrence of the name of the city of Salerno in the *Chronicon Salernitanum* (at fol. 9r) was initially highlighted by a pointing hand drawn in the external margin, exactly at the line in question. Between the fourteenth and the sixteenth centuries at least six different hands wrote eight glosses, all concerned with the city, next to, above and below the *manicula* (some of them being cited in the following paragraphs), as well as in the internal and lower margins.

Glosses providing basic information about the contents of subsequent parts of a text were, obviously, much more efficient means of consultation. They might serve as a substitute for a table of contents

Bibliothèque nationale de France, *Bullettino dell'Istituto Storico Italiano per il Medio Evo*, cxii (2010), 91–136; *idem*, ‘Quand une traduction remplace l’original: la méthode du traducteur de l’*Historia Normannorum* d’Aimé du Mont-Cassin’, in Alessandra Petrina (ed.), *The Medieval Translator. Traduire au Moyen Age. In principio fuit interpres* (The Medieval Translator, 15, Turnhout, 2013), 63–74.

or even for an index, when providing cross-references to the same term, name, or topic.²² This was a concern for the most prolific commentator (D) of the Lombard chronicles (BAV, Vat. lat. 5001):

- [fol. 9r, *Chronicon Salernitanum*, c. 10] et de eadem [i.e., on Salerno] uide per istum infra in .ix. carta. [= fol. 17v, *Chronicon Salernitanum*, c. 28] et uide unde dicatur Salernum et de issto Archi principe qui eam ampliauit ut infra in hoc uolumine carta lxxxxviii [= fol. 107v, *Erchempertus*, c. 3]
- [fol. 107v, *Erchempertus*, c. 3] Nota de ciuitate Salerni de qua uide ut supra in hoc libro. lxxxxviii. carta [= fol. 9r, *Chronicon Salernitanum*, c. 10].²³

The following marginal glosses suggest that this may also have been a concern for the copyist of Paulinus Venetus's *Satyrice historia* (BAV, Vat. lat. 1960), working in Naples at the end of the 1330s:

- [at chapter 202, 5, fol. 214vb] De Neapoli ccix. particula .ij
- [at chapter 209, 2, fol. 218va] De Neapoli. ccxvii. particula .ij.
- [at chapter 220, 6, fol. 223ra] De Roberto Guiscardi .C. ccxxij. particula .ij.²⁴

²² Cf. Birger Munk Olsen, *L'étude des auteurs classiques latins aux XIe et XIIe siècles*, iv, 2: *La réception de la littérature classique. Manuscrits et textes* (Paris, 2014), 245–8, in particular his observation on the ninth-century First Decade of Livy (today Paris, BnF, lat. 5724: <<http://gallica.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/btv1b8478999q>> [Accessed: Aug. 1, 2015]). The difference between the two types of instruments is worth stressing, cf. Malcolm Parkes ('*Folia librorum quaerere: Medieval experience of the problems of hypertexts and the index*', in Claudio Leonardi, Marcello Morelli, and Francesco Santi [eds.], *Fabula in tabula. Una storia degli indici dal manoscritto al testo elettronico. Atti del Convegno di studio, Certosa del Galluzzo, 21–22 ottobre 1994* [Spoleto, 1995], 23–41, here: 30 f., 35–9), who discusses the table of contents among the 'apparatus which follows the *ordo narrationis*', and the index as an example of the "apparatus which provided independent access to subordinate material in a text."

²³ All manuscript quotations faithfully follow the spelling of the specific manuscript. My interventions are confined to solving abbreviations and modernising the use of upper cases and punctuation. The missing letters appear in angle brackets.

²⁴ The internal divisions of both Lombard chronicles are distinguished by simple initials in red ink alone, without either numbers or titles, in case they ever existed (I am referring to the numbering introduced by modern editors: Ulla Westerbergh, *Chronicon Salernitanum: A Critical Edition with Studies on Literary and Historical Sources and on Language* [Stockholm, 1956]; and *Erchemperti Historia Langobardorum Beneventanorum*, ed. Georg Waitz, [MGH, SS rer. Lang., Hannover, 1878], 231–64). As a result, when establishing cross-references, the glossator D counted leaves backwards and forwards, and sometimes also provided the incipit of the paragraph he referred to. By contrast, the copyist of Paulinus's work could refer to the author's division of the text into *capitula* and *particulae*.

This scribe might have put into words an idea of the author himself, who, though born in Venice, resided in the Kingdom of Naples from 1326 until his death in 1344. In the case of *Satyrica historia*, the cross-references are in fact a supplement to abundant, though uncompleted (at least in the manuscript known to me), fifteen subject indexes which precede the text of the chronicle, together with the list of rubrics (or the table of contents). They probably belong to the author's project; at least, the *Satyrica historia* received such an apparatus during Paulinus's lifetime.²⁵ Vincent of Beauvais is believed to have been the first medieval historian to systematically provide indexes for his works. He added an index to every single book of the *Speculum historiale* after 1244. They are, however, rather selective and include only 1808 entries. This kind of apparatus only spread in the field of historical writing during the fourteenth century, beginning with the *Tabula secundum litterarum ordinem alphabeti* on the same work by Vincent, composed by Jean Hautfuney in Avignon around 1320 (the number of rubrics increased to over 12000).²⁶

²⁵ The 'tabulae' (fols. 28ra–47ra, NB the dimensions of the manuscript are around 441 x 283 mm) mainly contain references to the chronicle, but also to Paulinus's other works copied at the beginning of the codex, i.e. *De mappa mundi* (13ra–21vb) and *De diis gentium et fabulis poetarum* (25ra–27rb). Many entries, however, remained without references to chapters. The MS BAV, Vat. lat. 1960, has recently been digitalized, <http://digi.vatlib.it/view/MSS_Vat.lat.1960> [Accessed: Aug. 1, 2015]. According to the descriptions available to me, the same series of indexes is found in two of nine other copies of the *Satyrica historia*, made before the end of the fifteenth century: Bamberg, Staatsbibliothek, Hist. 4/1–2 (14th c.), and Dresden, Sächsische Landesbibliothek, L 7 (15th c.), a fragment may be found in MS Firenze, Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana, Plut. XXI, sin. 1 (14th c.). A similar series of ten indexes (a general one followed by nine subject-indexes) precedes the text of another one of Paulinus's universal chronicles, namely the longer version of the *Compendium*, in the MS Paris, BnF, lat. 4939, fols. 4v–7r (available on the *Gallica*, <<http://gallica.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/btv1b55002483j>> [Accessed: Aug. 1, 2015]). Cf. Isabelle Heullant-Donat, 'Entrer dans l'histoire. Paolino da Venezia et les prologues de ses chroniques universelles', *Mélanges de l'Ecole française de Rome. Moyen Age*, cv, 1 (1993), 381–442, here: 401, 432–5; *eadem*, 'Boccaccio lecteur de Paolino da Venezia: lectures discursives et critiques', in Michelangelo Picone and Claude Cazalé Bérard (eds.), *Gli Zibaldoni di Boccaccio. Memoria, scrittura, riscrittura. Atti del Seminario internazionale di Firenze-Certaldo (26–28 aprile 1996)* (Firenze, 1998), 37–52, here: 38, 52.

²⁶ See the study and edition by Monique Paulmier, 'Jean Hautfuney, *Tabula super Speculum historiale fratris Vincentii*', *Spicae. Cahiers de l'Atelier Vincent de Beauvais, Nouvelle série*, 2 (1980), 19–263 (on Vincent's indexes, see 20–3), and *ibidem*,

The types of apparatus discussed thus far remain, so to speak, at the threshold of commentary. Marginal or interlinear glosses providing even short explanations may already be considered a modest form of commentary, due to their capacity to deal with most of the aspects usually discussed by more discursive and systematic commentaries. One must also note that in addition to incidental glosses, sets of glosses, which by virtue of their characteristics verge on real *opuscula*, are also found in historical manuscripts. For example, the apparatus of glosses on the *Liber Pontificalis* by Pierre Bohier is preceded by a dedication to Charles V, king of France. The exemplar presented to the monarch in 1380 is believed to have been lost. The glosses, however, have been handed down, either in conjunction with the commented text, or separately, in a few copies produced between the end of the fourteenth and the fifteenth centuries.²⁷ Sets of glosses less systematic than Bohier's may also be distinguished by their

3 (1981), 5–208. Both Vincent's and Jean's indexes are discussed within the history of medieval historiography by Guenée, *Histoire et culture historique*, 232–7, and within the history of medieval indexes by Olga Weijers, 'Les index au Moyen Âge sont-ils un genre littéraire?' in Leonardi, Morelli, Santi (eds.), *Fabula in tabula*, 11–22, here: 20–1, and il. 5.

²⁷ Pierre Bohier, a French Benedictine, was appointed bishop of Orvieto in 1364 and subsequently papal vicar in Rome. It was then that he became acquainted with the manuscript containing the version of the *Liber Pontificalis* continued by cardinal Pandulphus up to Honorius II and rearranged once again by Petrus Gullielmus, librarian at Saint-Gilles, in the second quarter of the twelfth century (today BAV, Vat. lat. 3762). It was that particular version of the 'catalogue' of Roman bishops that Bohier commented upon. After the schism of 1378, he followed Clement VII to Avignon and then accepted Charles V's invitation to join him at his court. It was probably there that Bohier concluded his commentary. Towards the end of his life, Bohier abandoned the Avignon obedience and returned to Italy where he died in 1388. The glosses have been edited by Ulderico Přerovský, *Liber Pontificalis nella recensione di Pietro Guglielmo OSB e del card. Pandolfo, glossato da Pietro Bohier OSB, vescovo d'Orvieto. Introduzione, testo, indici*, iii: *Glosse* (Studia Gratiana, 23, Roma, 1978) [hereinafter: Bohier, *Glosse*], as was the commented text, *ibidem*, ii: *Liber Pontificalis* (Studia Gratiana, 22, Roma, 1978) [hereinafter: LP]; cf. on the commented text, the glosses and Bohier himself, *ibidem*, i: *Introduzione. Indici* (Studia Gratiana, 21, Roma, 1978). Contrary to what Přerovský believed, the MS BAV, Barb. lat. 584, chosen as the basis of his edition, is datable to the end of the fourteenth century, not the fifteenth, and it does not share features with the manuscripts of Bohier's other works produced in the abbey of Polirone in northern Italy. Both the script and the decoration point to northern France, if not to Paris (I am indebted to Francesca Manzari's expertise in dating and localizing the

own manuscript tradition: fifty marginal glosses, written by either the scribe or a contemporary glossator, in an early medieval copy of Orosius's *Histories* (BAV, Vat. lat. 1974) reappear, all due the copyist of the main text, in a slightly posterior copy (BAV, Reg. lat. 691; this would also refer to the interlinear glosses, according to a selective survey).²⁸ Below is a short selection of marginal annotations.

BAV, Vat. lat. 1974	BAV, Reg. lat. 691
Babilon nouissime eo tempore a Cyro rege subuersa quo primum Roma a Tarquiniorum regum dominatione liberata est (I, 2, 9)	
¶ notandum [notandum by the copyist, <i>entirely by the copyist</i>] Notandum quod <i>the rest by another hand</i>] quod duo sunt	duo sunt Tarquini, superbus et priscus, Tarquini, superbus et priscus, qui Romam deuastauerunt (19r)
Similiter et Roma post annos totidem hoc est mille .c. sexaginta et fere iiii ^{or} a Gothis et Halarico rege eorum comite autem suo inrupta (II, 3, 3)	
De Halarico rege et Gothis qui Romam expoliauerunt [till now by the copyist, <i>a gloss by another hand follows a capite</i>] comes nomen gradus apud Romanos qui ciuitatis dominator est (16v)	[both glosses by the copyist] De Halarico rege et Gothis qui Romam expoliauerunt. Comes nomen gradus apud Romanos qui ciuitatis dominator est (19r)
sceleratorum manum promissa impunitate collegit (II, 4, 3)	
Asilum enim constituit [est and few other words have been erased, illegible even in UV light] in quem qui fugisset innocens fieri deberet. Unde Eusebius ait. Ob asili impunitatem magna multitudo Romulo iungitur (17r)	Asilum enim constituit id est locum consecratum uel sanctum in quem qui fugisset innocens fieri deberet. Unde Eusebius ait. Ob Asili impunitatem magna multitudo Romulo iungitur (19v)

illumination). In short, this manuscript would not only be the best, but also the oldest, witness of the commentary.

²⁸ The MS Vat. lat. 1974 (total dimensions 323 x 227, writing frame 247 x 170) was written by several hands in caroline minuscule with some elements betraying either a non-caroline graphic education of the scribes, or a non-caroline model. It is datable to the tenth-eleventh centuries. The MS Reg. lat. 691 (total dimensions 302 x 219, writing frame 237 x 157) was written in a mature caroline minuscule, perhaps in Brittany in the eleventh century (so Wallace M. Lindsay, 'Breton Scriptoria: their Latin Abbreviations-symbols', *Zentralblatt für Bibliothekswesen*, xxix [1912], 265). The close relationship between the two manuscripts is confirmed by the common variant readings of Isidore's *Chronica maiora*, which in both codices follow Orosius. Cf. the case of the set of glosses on Josephus's *Antiquitates Iudaicae*, common to several Carolingian copies, discussed by Richard M. Pollard, 'Reading

It was not unusual for the apparatus of a commentary to have been foreseen as early as a manuscript page was being prepared for copying or as late as when the main text was being copied.²⁹ A quite early example is provided by the two oldest manuscripts of a central Italian chronicle, ascribed to Augustine and Jerome (*Chronica beatorum Augustini et Hieronimi*), but which is in fact a rearrangement of Isidore's *Chronica maiora*: the text itself is datable to after the mid-tenth century, while the manuscripts are datable to the turn of the eleventh to the twelfth. A narrow column within the writing frame was reserved for an apparatus, written in a script of smaller volume by the same scribe who copied the text of the chronicle.³⁰ This layout was both unusual and rather troublesome to execute, and one should not be surprised to see the apparatus included in the text of the

Josephus at Vivarium? Annotations and Exegesis in Early Copies of the Antiquities', *Florilegium*, xxx (2013), 103–42.

²⁹ The problem of the *mise en page* for manuscripts with commentary has been widely studied by codicologists, see Marilena Maniaci, *Archeologia del manoscritto. Metodi, problemi, bibliografia recente* (Roma, 2002), 114–17. However, manuscripts with historical contents are hardly present in the analysed *corpora*. The most influential proposals of layout pattern classifications come from Gerhardt Powitz, 'Textus cum commento', *Codices manuscripti*, v (1979), 80–9; and Holtz, 'Glosse e commenti', 89–104; see also the reflection on typologies and terminology by Jacques-Hubert Sautel, 'Essai de terminologie de la mise en page des manuscrits à commentaire', *Gazette du livre médiévale*, xxxv (1999), 17–31.

³⁰ The apparatus consists of seven *excursus* providing some chronological data additional to that conveyed by the chronicle. In both manuscripts, it appears on selected pages and occupies a narrow column cut out from the writing frame, most often next to the exterior margin. The result is similar to scheme no. 2 of Powitz (or class C of Holtz), but different since the apparatus here is an enclave surrounded by the main text from two or three sides (cf. also scheme 8 of Powitz). In the MS Paris, BnF, lat. 2321, of dimensions around 247 x 156 (195 x 115), the apparatus is only incidentally separated from the main text by a limit line, as high as the given fragment (so at fol. 145r). By contrast, in the MS Wien, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, 580, the apparatus had already been foreseen during the ruling of the twentieth quire, which comprises most of the chronicle. Thus, every page appears divided into two columns, a wider interior and a narrower exterior, the latter destined for the apparatus (which, however, does not occur at every page and rarely occupies the whole column), see the central bifolium (fols. 154–5, written spaces in bold): 35+**155**+10 x (25+3+**25**+3+**58**+4+13) + (12+4+**58**+3+**26**+3+25). In this case, the project realized through ruling corresponds to scheme 1 of Powitz (class B of Holtz) and is different from the final *mise en page* as expressed by the relation between the two sequences of the text.

chronicle in some later copies. It was more common to make room for an apparatus by widening the margins and broadening the interlinear space. Such is the case, for example, of a twelfth-century copy of Sallust (BAV, Ottob. lat. 1648), where half of the interlinear space and external margins, almost half a column wide, were reserved for glosses.³¹ In a fifteenth-century exemplar of *De bello Gallico* (BAV, Reg. lat. 763) the writing frame or itself was divided into three columns, the central (and the widest) containing Caesar's text, the lateral (and narrower) columns containing the glosses.³² The oldest manuscript of the *Liber Pontificalis* with Bohier's commentary (BAV, Barb. lat. 584) reproduces a scheme well known from many scholastic codices, where the text proper is laid into two columns surrounded by the apparatus.³³

³¹ *Mise en page* (measures taken from fol. 13r; written space in bold): 195 (21+**164**+10) x 136 (20+**80**+36), the height of the column measured from the top to the bottom line (script above the top line), interlinear space: ca 7. The manuscript was probably produced in Northern Italy or Southern France towards the end of the twelfth century. It contains both of Sallust's monographs. The texts, reproduced in an early *littera textualis*, are accompanied by unsystematic glosses due to many hands, the oldest seeming contemporaneous to the copy. Cf. Elisabeth Pellegrin (ed.), *Les Manuscrits classiques latins de la Bibliothèque vaticane*, i (Paris, 1975), 636 f.; Osmond and Ulery, 'Sallustius', 232 f., 286.

³² *Mise en page* (measures taken from fol. 13r; written spaces in bold): 310 (69+**219**+22) x 220 (5+**22**+8+**122**+9+**38**+16, the scheme is mirrored at the opening). Although the glosses do not form a continuous apparatus, the project verges on schema no 3 of Powitz (class B of Holtz). This parchment codex was produced in Northern Italy at the beginning of the fifteenth century. The glosses were written in conjunction with the commented text, by the same scribe. Cf. Elisabeth Pellegrin (ed.), *Les manuscrits classiques latins de la Bibliothèque Vaticane*, ii, 1 (Paris, 1978), 106 f.

³³ *Mise en page* (measures taken from fol. 15r; written spaces in bold): 452 (70+**35**+20+**273**+14+**21**+19) x 286 (12+3+**19**+13+**71**+17+**72**+16+**35**+28), the project corresponds to scheme no. 6 of Powitz (class C of Holtz). While the height of the columns of the text commented upon is rather constant (44 lines of text and 45 ruled lines), dimensions may instead show considerable variation in the lower and upper part of commentary. The ruling by lead point was performed separately on every page. A quire containing an alphabetical index was added to the already existing codex shortly after the latter was copied (fol. 1r-7v, fol. 8 blank, rubr. 'Tabula per alphabetum ordinata ad reperiendum facilius testuales materias magis notabiles codicis subsequentis'). It is worth noticing that in referring to the *Liber Pontificalis* it essentially follows the passages highlighted by the commentary.

III

Having sketched some aspects of formal diversification and some patterns of display, it is time to focus on the content of commentaries. Let me begin with the introductions to the authors or *accessus ad auctores*. The ancient authors of historical writings (or writings also considered to be historical), who had become school authors, namely Sallust and Lucan, were the subject of many such introductions which often circulated together with the commentaries. The biographical notices required by *accessus* sometimes developed into autonomous *vitae*.³⁴ Complete *accessus* to the other ancient and medieval historians seem to have been rare, but at least one modest introduction is known to me. Both aforementioned copies of Orosius's *Histories* contain a *praefatiuncula* which provides some biographical data (partly derived from Gennadius's *De viris illustribus*³⁵), presents different etymologies of the name of Orosius, and discusses the aim and the date of the work.³⁶

³⁴ See Osmond and Ulery, 'Sallustius', *passim*, and Munk Olsen, *L'étude des auteurs*, iv, 1, 83–7, 99–103.

³⁵ In fact, some historians have been portrayed in various collections of *de viris illustribus*, both Classical and Christian. One illustration, significant for being local and rather late, is Peter the Deacon's (d. after 1159) *Liber illustrium virorum archisterii casinensis*, which includes the major Cassinese writers of history: Paul the Deacon, Erchempertus, Amatus, Leo, Guido, and finally the author himself (see the edition by Antonio Ludovico Muratori [Rerum Italicarum Scriptores, vi, Milano, 1725], coll. 9–62). Instead, 'hystoriographi' as a group in its own right appear in some historical writings, especially those from the beginning of the twelfth century onwards, more often in the form of a simple list, but sometimes they are presented in more detail. This is the case of Ralph de Diceto, who provided brief notes on forty-two history writers, followed by an anthology of fragments of their works, in the *Abbreviationes chronicorum* (ed. William Stubbs, *The Historical Works of Master Ralph de Diceto*, i [London, 1876], 20–33; cf. Bernard Guenée, 'Les premiers pas de l'histoire de l'historiographie en Occident au XIIe siècle', *Comptes rendus de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles Lettres*, cxxvii, 1 [1983], 136–52).

³⁶ The quote is from the MS BAV, Vat. lat. 1974 (where the text appears at the verso of a leaf belonging to the guard bifolium, without foliation, today placed between fols. 5 and 6), providing the only significant variant reading (or a reasonable correction) of the MS Reg. lat. 691, fol. 1r. A survey of the database *In Principio* (Brepolis) shows that the manuscripts under consideration are the oldest witnesses to this introduction, but not the only ones.

[*Rubr.*] Incipit Praefantiuncula in Orosio. [*Textus*] Orosius presbiter Taraconensis, Hispanus genere, vir eloquens et historiarum cognitor, Augustini discipulus, aduersus querelas christiani nominis hos septem scripsit libellos. Orosius siue de ora ut quidam putant deriuatur, siue quod uerius orios grece mons, latine orosius, muntanus exprimitur. Orosius de Maturia quidam existimant dici. Sciendum est quod haec ars nominatur ornesta, id est miserabilis, uel gemitus, eo quod miseria mundi continet. Locus huius artis Kartago est, ut idem in libris posterioribus ait: Quamquam diu nos Kartago retinet forsitan externas clades alienorum ad memoriam reuocemus. Tempus Honorii et Arcadii, filiorum scilicet magni Theodosii. Et infine illius persona autem Orosii discipuli Augustini. De quo Ieronimus [Augustinus *super rasuram Reg. lat.* 691] ait: Ecce uenit ad me religiosus iuuenis catholica pace, frater aetate, filius honore, presbiter noster Orosius. Vigil ingenio, paratus eloquio, flagrans studio, utile uas in domo domini esse desiderans, ad repellendas falsas perniciosasque doctrinas, gemma dei dicitur. Hic est Orosius qui ab Augustino missus est pro discenda anime ratione ad Ieronimum, quique sancti Stephani ad occidentales plagas detulit reliquias. [*Rubr.*] Explicit Praefaciuncula.

The topics traditionally required by an *accessus* might also appear scattered throughout the commentary or single glosses.³⁷ Pierre Bohier deals with the authorship of the *Liber Pontificalis* in several of his glosses and ascribes the first set of papal biographies to Pope Damasus, and the last to Pandulphus (I shall provide, when necessary, a fragment of the commented text in square brackets):

[meque Pandulphum usque ad subdiaconum promovit, *LP* 163 (*Calixtus II*), 747] Proprium nomen. Et fuit scriptor huius cronicae in hac ultima parte. Primus enim fuit Damasus papa, ut patet supra, in principio. Alii vero plures fuerunt scriptores cronicarum huiusmodi. Sed intra sedem apostolicam habitabant et de ipsa et per ipsam electi erant, immo et aliqui erant cardinales, ar. supra, c.clviii in principio. Ad idem supra, c. prox. § discurrit, in fine.³⁸

In a similar way, the anonymous French-speaking translator from Angevin Southern Italy carefully mined his texts for information about their authors. Thus, he could ascribe to Eutropius the recollection of taking part in Emperor Julian the Apostate's Parthian expedition,

³⁷ Cf. Eva M. Sanford, 'The manuscripts of Lucan: *Accesus* and *Marginalia*', *Speculum*, ix, 3 (1934), 285, 290.

³⁸ Bohier, *Glosse*, 163 (*Calixtus II*), no. 48, 590, cf. 4 (*Clemens*), no. 2, 19.

a recollection which Paul the Deacon had repeated without changing the grammatical person (*Historia romana* X, 16): “Et cestui Julien o grant appareliement donna bataille a li Thurc, en laquel bataille ce dit Eutroppe, qui premerement escrist cest liure, quar il meismes i fu present” (BnF, fr. 688, fol. 58ra).³⁹ The same translator could not name the author of a history of the Normans, nowadays identified as Amatus of Montecassino, that he was rendering into French. He could, however, identify him as a monk of Montecassino and a contemporary to most of the recounted events thanks to some passages from his chronicle.⁴⁰

The questions about textual tradition, variant readings and, consequently, that of the correct form of a text were raised by several conscientious medieval commentators of ancient historians, including Thiofrid of Echternach on Sallust in the mid-eleventh century,⁴¹ Landolfo Colonna on Justinus⁴² and, in particular, Petrarch, and Paolo de Bernardo on Livy⁴³ during the fourteenth century, and Gasperino and Guiniforte Barzizza on Caesar at the beginning of the

³⁹ Cf. the Latin text (*Pauli Diaconi Historia romana*, ed. Amedeo Crivellucci [Roma, 1914], 147): “Hinc Iulianus rerum potitus est ingentique apparatu Parthis intulit bellum, cui expeditioni ego quoque interfui”.

⁴⁰ See his commentary on the author’s desire to die under the rule of Abbot Desiderius, the work’s dedicatee (III, 52): “Et par ceste parole se mostre, que cestui moinne translateor de ceste ystoire fu a lo temps de cestui abbe Desidere, loquel fu tant saint home et de bone uie et plein de grant sapience” (BnF, fr. 688, fol. 156ra). Another statement by the author concerning Duke Robert Guiscard, who, after having conquered Palermo, “by the grace of God held what he won and continued to conquer” (“et par la grace de dieu tint ce q<u>e il veinchi et acquesta continuelment”, VI, 22) – where the main clause might have been in the Present tense in the Latin version – has led the translator to conclude that the chronicle was written while the duke was still alive: “et ce doit entendre, que quant lo duc estoit uif ceste ystoire fu escripte, et puiz vescu longuement” (fol. 177vb).

⁴¹ Munk Olsen, *L'étude des auteurs*, iv, 1, 289.

⁴² Elisabeth Pellegrin, ‘Un manuscrit de Justin annoté par Landolfo Colonna (Leyde, Voss. lat. Q. 101)’, *Italia Medioevale e Umanistica*, iii (1960), 242–9.

⁴³ On Petrarch commenting Livy, see Giuseppe Billanovich, *La tradizione del testo di Livio e le origini dell’Umanesimo*, i: *Tradizione e fortuna di Livio tra Medioevo e Umanesimo* (Padova, 1981), 97–122. On Paolo de Bernardo’s copy of the First Decade of the *Ab Urbe condita* (BnF, lat. 5727, copied between 1 September 1388 and 2 March 1389) and his glosses on it, see Lino Lazzarini, *Paolo de Bernardo e i primordi dell’umanesimo in Venezia* (Genève, 1930), 90–2, 134–7, 228–32 (edition of selected glosses). I express my gratitude to Miika Kuha for bringing this manuscript to my attention.

fifteenth.⁴⁴ Apart from cases of combining readings from different exemplars into a new ‘contaminated’ or ‘edited’ copy of a text (the reasons for which are usually undetectable for us today), I do not know of any similar ‘pre-ecdotic’ operations concerning non-classical historical writings.⁴⁵ Nevertheless, an attempt to historically explain the existence of different versions of the same text was made by the translator of Paul the Deacon’s *Historia romana*. In the prologue to his translation, he stated that Paul had composed two editions of this work. Since the translator distinguished them by incipit, it has been possible to identify them within the work’s manuscript tradition and conclude that both were used by the translator in the French text:

[*Rubric*] Ci comence le prologue en uulgal. [*Text*] Car Ysidoire parla molt breuement par toute la matiere come se puisse alongier juste cose est d’altre choze et d’autre cronique et ystoire metre main, a ce que misire le conte plus plenement et sa uolente soit contente. Et pour ce dirons et raconterons en li capitule de souz ce que Eutroppe romain escrit de l’ystoire de Rome. Laquel Paul dyacono et moinee de Mont de Cassim aorna par diuersez aionttions. Digne choze est a lui de translater en uulgal sermon et de sauoir, que cestui Paule dui foiz escripst ceste ystoire de le deuant dit Eutrope a la petition de dui nobillissime marit et moillier de Boniuient,

⁴⁴ The MS BAV, Barb. lat. 148, containing Caesar’s *Commentarii* and the *Vitae Caesarum* of Suetonius, dates back to the end of the fourteenth century. At the beginning of the following century it became the property of Gasperino Barzizza, reader in grammar, rhetoric and moral philosophy in Pavia, Padua and Milan. After Gasperino’s death in 1431, it was inherited by his son Guiniforte, who combined the work of lecturer with diplomatic missions on behalf of the Visconti, the d’Este and the Sforza. Both father and son provided the aforementioned texts with glosses, mainly of philological character, signing some of them with their names. This apparatus is briefly discussed in Geraldine McGrath, ‘An Unknown Fourteenth-century Commentary on Suetonius and Caesar’, *Classical Philology*, lxx (1970), 182–5. The manuscript is described in Pellegrin (ed.), *Les manuscrits classiques*, i, 181f. For more on the Barzizza, see Guido Martelotti’s entry in *Dizionario biografico degli Italiani* [hereinafter: DBI], 7 (Roma, 1970), 34–9 and 39–41 respectively. Gasperino and Guiniforte also owned copies of some other ancient historians, such as Livy, Florus’s *Epitome*, *Periochae Livianae*, and Justinus, which they usually glossed on (see Ugo Lepore, ‘Postille petrarchesche o note del Barzizza’, *Giornale italiano di filologia*, iii [1950], 347–5; Caterina Tristano, *La Biblioteca di un umanista calabrese: Aulo Giano Parrasio* [Manziana, {1989}], no. 201).

⁴⁵ Cf. Pollard, ‘Libri di scuola spirituale’, 382, who mentions some variants listed in a ninth-century copy of the Latin *Antiquitates Iudaicae* of Josephus (Cologny, Fondation Martin Bodmer, Cod. Bodmer 98).

li compaire del deuant dit dyacono. Mes pource que celle premiere estoit trop fort stille alla dame, une autre foiz celle meissme ystoire comensa ensi: coment dient li autre. Tutez voiez par celle seconde est trop proluxe et trop longue. Et non pour tant par maniere de ystoire, quant par maniere de predication procede a exponere la premiere, laquelle en comence: premier en Ytalie. Et adonc plasoit a l'escruiain de receuoir le quel cerche par son pooir a seruir a uostre comandement. [Rubric] Ce est la epystole de Paul dyacone et monache de Mont de Cassino a son tres excellent et excellente compere et commere siens de Boniuient" (BnF, fr. 688, fol. 11va).⁴⁶

IV

Both in historiography and other genres, commentary proper could be concerned with a text's different levels of meaning. Before exploring its profound meaning (*sententia*), commentary was supposed to explain single words and passages on both linguistic and semantic levels (*littera, sensus litteralis*). Linguistic commentary could describe grammatical and syntactical features, comment on rhetorical figures and generally assess style or literary value. This kind of commentary may be illustrated by some glosses on the *Iughurtine* by the anonymous commentator from the turn of the twelfth to the thirteenth century, the so-called Anonymus Bernensis (the underlined words within quotations will refer to the *lemmata*):

[quom ipse ad imperandum Tisidium vocaretur, *Bellum Iughurtinum* 62, 8] Tisidium. Ad illud opidum imperandum ut imperaretur illi. Gerundium pro uerbo. Dicit enim Priscianus gerundia pro uerbis et pro nominibus poni (BAV, Ottob. lat. 3291, fol. 77rb).

⁴⁶ The incipit of the first redaction 'Premier en Italie' corresponds to that present in most existing witnesses and is considered the original one: 'Primus in Italia' (see *Pauli Diaconi Historia romana*, ed. Crivellucci, 5). The incipit of another version attributed to Paul 'Comment dient li autre' is, in fact, that of a tenth-century rearrangement ('Et dicunt alii' in the oldest witness Bamberg, Staatsbibliothek, Hist. 3, fol. 24ra, of the turn of the 10th to the 11th century, and 'Ut dicunt alii' in the MS BAV, Urb. lat. 961, fol. 54ra, of the 14th century); on the uses of both versions, see Jakub Kujawiński, *Non se troue que cestui capitule die plus, toutes uoiez la rubrica plus demostre*. Su alcuni problemi della ricerca sui rapporti fra volgarizzamento e tradizione del testo latino (esempio della collezione storiografica del codice, Paris, BnF, fr. 688), in Alessandro Musco and Giuliana Musotto (eds.), *Coexistence and Cooperation in the Middle Ages. IV European Congress of Medieval Studies F.I.D.E.M. 23–27 June 2009, Palermo* (Palermo, 2014), 745–61, here: 755–9.

[*Bellum Iugurthinum* 14, 15] Quid agam. Color rethoricus est, dubitatio permixta questioni (BAV, Ottob. lat. 3291, fol. 70rb).

[*Bellum Iugurthinum* 110, 6, Bocchus's speech] Bellum ego et cetera. More boni oratoris in principio sue orationis purgat se a crimine ut postea uerisimilis uideatur eius oratio uel narratio (BAV, Ottob. lat. 3291, fol. 85ra).⁴⁷

This kind of commentary primarily concerned the ancient historians included in the programme of *trivium*, originating in use in actual teaching. However, readers interested in historiography in other contexts may also have paid attention to both linguistic and stylistic features, especially if they were authors themselves, such as Petrarch. He frequently evaluated the literary value of Livy's text in the margins of one of his exemplars (BnF, lat. 5690): "similis constructio infra ...", "pulchra elocutio", "pulcra persuasio et utilis".⁴⁸

A basic semantic commentary usually provided an explanation of possibly ambiguous forms, synonyms or definitions of terms considered rare for some reason. Anonymus Bernensis, for instance, was very concerned with disambiguating pronouns, as illustrated by the following gloss on the *Bellum Iugurthinum* 58, 2: 'nostrī, scilicet Romani' (BAV, Ottob. lat. 3291, fol. 76vb). In both copies of *De bello Gallico* mentioned above, early fifteenth-century commentators considered it necessary to explain the term 'obaerati' ('obaeratosque', I, 4, 2):

[BAV, Reg. lat. 763, fol. 9v] Oberatos, id est pecunia conductos ad bellum gerendum.

[BAV, Barb. lat. 148, fol. 67va, in the interlinear space] alias ambactos. [in the external margin by the same hand:] Oberati, debitores ere deuincti. G<asperinus> B<arzizza>. Ambacti, ambitu acti [the rest is probably by Guiniforte Barzizza:] vel potius serui quasi circumacti. Sed puto Cesarem potius oberatos hic dixisse quam ambactos, id est seruos, cum iam dixerit ante: suam familiam.

⁴⁷ On the Anonymus Bernensis, see Osmond and Ulery, 'Sallustius', 225–7, 284 f. The manuscript from which the quotations derive is one of the more recent witnesses, datable to the first half of the fifteenth century and localised in north-eastern Italy (Romagna or Veneto), as suggested by watermarks (see particularly Briquet no. 2666). It contains commentaries (without texts proper, which are referred to through *lemmata* only) on the *Poetria nova* by Geoffrey of Vinsauf (1ra–17ra), *De nuptiis* by Martianus Capella (17va–57rb), and both of Sallust's monographs, *Bellum Catilinae* (57va–67vb) and *Bellum Iugurthinum* (67vb–85va).

⁴⁸ *Postille di Francesco Petrarca*, ed. Enrico Fenzi, in Cicuto, Crevatin, and Fenzi (eds.), *Reliquiarum servator*, 203–547, nos. 1, 67, and 229.

The troublesome character of single words may not only have derived from their being rare terms for objects or concepts of common knowledge, for example 'obaeratus' for 'debitor' / 'ambactus'. In fact, historical writings were, on a larger scale than many other genres, filled with names referring to peculiar elements of past realities, such as artefacts, places, institutions, and customs, which would hardly have been familiar to a reader distant in time and space. This is particularly true for ancient histories, where technical terms often became one of the main targets of commentators. This kind of explanation makes me turn – still within a literal sense – from strict lexicographical commentaries towards those expounding historical subject matter. In some cases, short definitions were considered sufficient, as illustrated by the gloss on 'comes' in Orosius manuscripts (see above p. 171) and by the following examples:

[*Ab Urbe condita* I, 20, 2] Curulis sella est sella magistratus vel sella triumphantium. Unde quod addit regia expositivum est eius quod dixit *curulis* (Nicolas Trevet⁴⁹)

[*De bello Gallico* I, 42, 6] Cohortis pretorie, que est prima cohors legionaria que numero et dignitate militum reliquas precedit, in qua sunt [quinque *del.*] equites loricatorum cxxxij. Et appellatur cohors miliaria et est caput legionis (BAV, Reg. lat. 763, fol. 17v).

In other cases, however, much longer, encyclopaedic or historical digressions were provided. Isidore's remark on the stoic philosopher Zeno ("Hoc tempore Zenon stoicus et Menander comicus et Theophrastes philosophus claruerunt") was amplified by the fourteenth-century translator with a discussion of post-Socratic schools:

[*Isidori Chronica* 198] En celui temps Zenone stoycus et Minander comicus, et Theophrastes phylosophes estoient clarissime en la science de phylosophie. [*the amplification follows*] En cellui temps Zenone estoit de la sette de li stoyci, dont est a entendre que est a dire stoyce. Stoyce est a dire de sauoir, que Socrates fist diuers argumens. Argumens fist a sauoir et a prouer que soit beatitude et somme bien. Aucun argument prouent, que lo somme bien est auoir richesse, aucune dient: auoir honor, et aucun dient: en complir sa uolente en mengier et en boire et en ioie et en solas. Pour l'occasion de ces trois oppinions l'escole de Socrates fu partice en troiz. Car li stoyce tenoient, que la beatude fust en richesse. Li paripatetici uoloient

⁴⁹ Quoted as it appears in the apparatus of Landolfo Colonna in MS BnF, lat. 5690 (see above note 10, ed. Crevatin, no. 20b, 40, italicas by GC).

que la beatitude fust en l'onor. Et li epycure uoloient que la beatitude fust en la uolente. Zenone fu adonc en la compaignie de li stoyci et alors regnoit (BnF, fr. 688, fol. 7va).

Such commentaries on particular elements of past realities may offer interesting insights into the ways that knowledge (historical and other) was conveyed at that time, and also into both the range and limitations of transmitting that knowledge. The excursus in question provides a very simplified overview of the history of ancient philosophy, even when compared to some contemporary discussions of the subject (as the one in Dante's *Convivio* IV, 6). It probably reflects basic information taught in fourteenth-century Italian elementary schools.⁵⁰ In other cases, explanations of technical terms could derive from encyclopaedias and lexicons, such as Isidore's *Etymologies* or, later in the Middle Ages, Papias's *Elementarium*, *Derivationes* by Hugutio of Pisa and others. Some glosses on the *Bellum Gallicum* in the fifteenth century Regi-nensis 763 manuscript quoted above are also quite instructive in that sense. The scribe responsible for both the text and glosses happens to explain the same term several times. Some differences between the definitions of the same word appear to be mechanical errors, typical for the copying process, suggesting that the glossator used a lexicon. We may compare, for example, two definitions of the ethnic name 'Numidae': "Numide sunt populi Affrice et boni sagittarii" (II, 10, 1; fol. 21v), and "Numidas. Affricani qui sunt boni Affricani" (II, 24, 4; fol. 24r), the latter containing a meaningless repetition of 'Affricani'.⁵¹

⁵⁰ This commentary may be compared to a contemporaneous gloss on Boethius's *De consolazione philosophiae* (lib. I, prosa 3), providing a similar tripartition of philosophy after the death of Socrates: "Hic ostendit phylosophia quomodo, mortuo Socrate, scholares sui habuerunt divortium, quia divisi sunt in tres partes. Una secta fuit Stoicorum, quorum principalis fuit Ceno; alia Epicureorum, quorum principales fuit Aristirpus, quamquam denominentur ab Epicuro; tertia fuit Peripateticorum, quorum principalis fuit Aristotiles" (Firenze, Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana, Pl. 89 sup. 82, fol. 2v). I quote this gloss after Robert Black, 'Boethius at School in Medieval and Renaissance Italy: Manuscripts Glosses to the Consolation of Philosophy', in Vincenzo Fera, Giacomo Ferraú and Silvia Rizzo (eds.), *Talking to the Text: Marginalia from Papyri to Print. Proceedings of a Conference Held at Erice, 26 Sept.–3 Oct. 1998*, 2 vols. (Messina, 2002), i, 203–68, here: 224, who showed that Boethius's work, frequently used in late medieval grammar classes in Italy, gave an opportunity to introduce some notions of philosophy at an early stage of education.

⁵¹ Cf. the explanation of the place name 'Lutecia Parisiorum' and the ethnic name 'Parisii': ["in Luteciam Parisiorum transfert" VI, 3, 4] "Lutecia. Est ciuitas

Explanations of single components of past realities may also illustrate different ways of how glossators approached historical writings. They often oscillated between searching for continuity and discovering change. The information on a Roman scribe reading a prayer in ‘tabulae’ in Valerius Maximus’s *Factorum et dictorum memorabilium libri* (IV, I, 10) was commented upon by Dionigi da Borgo San Sepolcro who pointed out that neither parchment nor paper was in use in ancient Rome (“publicis tabulis, quia tunc non erat pergameni siue carte usus in Roma”).⁵² Such a tension is particularly tangible in glosses on place names and topography, in particular on localities and territories somehow familiar to the reader. It may be observed that

Parisiensis, olim enim erat nomen gentis nomen urbis” (fol. 48r); [“Senones, Parisios, Pictones” VII, 4, 6] “Parisii. Quondam nomen gentis nunc nomen ciuitatis” (fol. 56r); [“cum quatuor legionibus Luteciam proficiscitur, id est oppidum Parisiorum, quod positum est in insula fluminis Sequane” VII, 57, 1] “Lutecia est ciuitas Parisiensis. Olim enim erat nomen gentis, nunc nomen urbis” (fol. 65v). The absence of the adverb ‘nunc’ in the first gloss, present in the two following glosses, must be considered a mechanical omission. The *glossarium* of place names opening the codex was not the source of these glosses: ‘Numide’ are missing, while ‘Numidia’ is defined as “Pars Affrice que Regna de Bogies et de Belina viij completitur” (fol. 6v). In fact, just the opposite may be true. The *glossarium* seems to have mined the glosses: it provides an explanation of the name ‘Lutecia’ with a variant characteristic for the first of the three Paris-glosses quoted above: “Leutecia [sic]. Est ciuitas Parisiensis. Olim enim erat nomen gentis nomen urbis” (fol. 5v). The glossary was probably added shortly after the *De bello Gallico* had been copied: it occupies an entire quaternion (fols. 1r–8v), ruled in red ink (as were the following quires), and was written in a French batârde (as opposed to an *antiqua* applied for the copy of Caesars’s work).

⁵² The commentary was completed shortly before Dionigi’s death in Naples in 1342. It is quoted here from the MS BAV, Vat. lat. 1924 (mid-14th c.), fol. 57ra. See also a similar gloss on ‘tabulas testamenti’ (VII, 7, 2): “Tabulas testamenti, quia tunc non erat usus pergameni sed omnia scribebantur in tabulis cereis” (fol. 118vb). On this commentary and its author see Dorothy M. Schullian, ‘Valerius Maximus’, in CTC, v (1984), 287–403, here: 324–9; cf. Franco Suitner (ed.), *Dionigi da Borgo Sansepolcro fra Petrarca e Boccaccio. Atti del convegno, Sansepolcro, 11–12 febbraio 2000* (Città di Castello, 2001). Cf. a commentary by Dionigi’s contemporary Giovanni Cavallini on Livy VII, 3, 5 (“Lex vetusta est, priscis litteris verbisque scripta”): “Nota quod alie erant figure licterarum quam modernarum et alius stilus dictandi”. The gloss has been handed down in the internal margin of a copy of an exemplar glossed by Cavallini, today BAV, Vat. lat. 1846, fol. 63r. I owe my knowledge of it to Marco Petoletti, ‘Nota pro consilio Polistorie mee orationem predictam. Giovanni Cavallini lettore di Livio’, *Italia Medioevale e Umanistica*, xxxix (1996), 47–76, here: 65.

the ancient origins (whether factual or imagined) of many places (or place names) in Romance Europe seem to have been of considerable interest to commentators. The glosses on Paris (see note 51) already discussed and some other place name annotations in the Reginensis copy of *De bello Gallico*, quoted below, are instructive in that sense. The glossator carefully matches ancient toponyms of Gaul to those of contemporary France, assiduously providing modern French names and, sometimes, remarks on modern political geography:

[I, 6, 3] Allobroge sunt quos Sabaudienses Delphinensesque appellamus, quatinus ab oppido Sancti Mauricij quod Rhodanus abluit usque ad oppidum Deromans ac flumen Ararim [*sic, sed Ysaram in glossario*] protenduntur in longitudinem ut ex .x. epistolarum Ciceronis constat. In latum uero ab Alpibus diuidentibus Gallos et Ytalos usque ad lacum Lemanium quem Ebenensem uulgo appellat (fol. 10r).

[V, 3, 4] Arduenna. Est silua que uocatur La Forest d'Ardenne (fol. 37v).

[VI, 44] Senones uetus nomen retinent, id est de Sens (fol. 55r).

[VII, 34, 2] Gergouia. Est ciuitas Claramonten, in Aruernia. Alij dicunt quod est Vson (fol. 61v).

Some glosses reveal an antiquarian interest in a given territory. In the margin of his copy of *The Lives of the Twelve Caesars* by Suetonius (BAV, Vat. lat. 1860), Boccaccio's friend Zanobi da Strada, for instance, described in detail the site of the villa of Lucullus:

[in uilla Lucullana, *Vita Tiberii*, 73:] ¶ Luciliana. Villa, fuit olim in litore maris quo Puteolis peruenitur Neapolim, inter promontorium Neside et Neapolim, posita ad radicem montis Posiripi, cuius uestigia a mari complexa sunt. Hec a piscatoribus neapolitanis Luculona dicitur, quam uulgo Lacaiola corrupte dicunt (fol. 37v).

Interest in the ancient origins of places is also visible in commentaries on medieval chronicles. In the margin of the passage first mentioning Salerno in the fourteenth-century copy of the *Chronicon Salernitanum* (BAV, Vat. lat. 5001, fol. 9r), the glossators D and E produced a short anthology of evidence on the city, drawing upon Valerius Maximus, Dionigi da Borgo San Sepolcro's Valerius Maximus commentary, Lucan and the lexicographer Papias:⁵³

⁵³ The parts damaged by trimming are distinguished here by a double slash, while the restored letters appear in angle brackets.

[*Glossator D*]

Et de ea Papias commemo<ra>t dicens quod Neapolis est opidum prope Salernum et de eadem commemorat Ualerius Maximus in //.

Et uide de eadem ur<be> magistrum Dyonisium in commento suo super Ualerio libro primo ipsius Ualerij capitulo //. ⁵⁴

[*Glossator E*]

De qua Lucanus libro. j^o. Radensque Salerni culta Siler. ⁵⁵

Similarly, Vincent's account of the foundation of Cracow (I, 7) stimulated an overview of the city's political and sacral topography in Jan's (John's) commentary. ⁵⁶

V

While still dealing with the commentaries on literal meaning, let me now consider explanations of the historical contents of entire sections of a text. If the easiest way to explain a word was to provide a synonym or a circumlocution, then the easiest way to explain a longer portion of text was to paraphrase or summarize. A kind of abstract opens John's commentaries on the subsequent segments (called 'epistolae') of Vincent's chronicle. In such summaries, scholastic commentators might often reveal (or impose) a readable structure on a given fragment. ⁵⁷ This is, for instance, the way that Trevet starts his commentary on Livy's First Decade. After discussing the reasons for Livy to begin his history with Aeneas and Latinus, Trevet highlights the subsequent episodes ("ostendendo primo ... secundo ... tertio").

⁵⁴ See Papias (from BAV, Ottob. lat. 2231, fol. 146vb, 12th c.): "Neapolis. Opidum quod olim Parthenope uocabatur prope Salernum"; *Valerii Maximi Facta et dicta memorabilia* VI, 8, 5 (ed. John Briscoe, i [Stuttgart and Leipzig, 1998], 419): "Adiunxit se his cladibus C. Plotius Plancus, Munati Planci consularis et censorii frater. qui cum a triumuiris proscriptus in regione Salernitana lateret"; cf. the gloss by Dionigi on Valerius I, I, 1: "anelia [auelia in the commented text, i.e. a uelia] ciuitas antiqua fuit cuius adhuc uestigia prope Salernum apparent" (from BAV, Vat. lat. 1924, fol. 2va).

⁵⁵ See *M. Annaei Lucani De bello civili*, II, 425–6 (ed. David R. Shackleton Bailey [ed. altera, Stuttgart, 1997], 39 f.): "radensque Salerni / tesca Siler" (the variant reading 'culta' occurs in many *codices recentiores*).

⁵⁶ Ioannes de Dąbrówka, *Commentum* I, 6, circa litteram, 32.

⁵⁷ Cf. Alastair J. Minnis, *Medieval Theory of Authorship: Scholastic Literary Attitudes in the Later Middle Ages*. (2nd edn. with a new preface by the author, Philadelphia, 2010), 149–51.

Then he distinguishes three subjects within the first episode (“circa primum tria facit, quia primo ostendit ... secundo docet ... tertio docet”), providing a series of explanations for each. As far as the first subject is concerned, for example, he supplies the date of Troy’s fall counted *ante urbem conditam* and the reasons why Aeneas and Antenor were spared, two taken from Livy himself, and another borrowed from Dares.⁵⁸ Relating the content may thus lead to incorporating into it information taken either from other sources or from other parts of the commented text itself. In one of his glosses on Livy, Petrarch points out the differences regarding the number of Romans who fell at the battle of Cannae:

[*Ab Urbe condita* XXII, 49, 15] hic cesorum numerus ambigue traditus videtur sed accipio XL m. peditum et Ilm. DCC equites legionarios fuisse tantundem vero civium aliorum et sociorum. Huic tamen conieture obstat

⁵⁸ Nikolaus Trevet, *Apparatus libri Titi Livi* I, 1, 1–4, ed. Wittlin, 2 f. (the edition is based on MS Paris, BnF, lat. 5745, fols. 2ra–b; italics by CJW): “Expleto prohemio scripturus auctor res gestas ab urbe condita ut conveniencius ad Romulum, a quo urbs nuncupata et condita est. Omissis progenitoribus Latinis Iano, Saturno, Pico et Faunio, quia circa eos multa fabulose conficta, ut promisit in prologo ab Enea et Latino rege orditur hystoriam, ostendendo, primo, quomodo Eneas de captivitate Troie evasit, secundo, quomodo cum Latino rege fedus iniit (ibi: Ibique egressi ... 1. 5); tercio, quomodo de eorum stirpe Romulus descendit (ibi: Nondum maturus ... 3. 1). Circa primum tria facit, quia primo ostendit quomodo Eneas et Anthenor de bello Troiano evaserunt: Greci ceperunt Troiam CCCCIIII annis ante urbem conditam; qui dum sevirant in Troianos, interfectis de eis – ut asserit Dares Frigius – CCLXXVIII milibus, pepercerunt tamen Anthenori et Enee propter duas causas: una fuit quod olim Grecos hospicio receperunt, et illicitum erat antiquitus ut aliquis hospiti suo nocumentum inferret; alia causa fuit quia isti suaserant Priamo, regi Troianorum, ut cum Grecis pacem faceret et eisdem Helenam raptam restitueret. Et hoc est quod dicit: *Achyvos*, id est Grecos, *omne ius belli*, id est omne quod licet iure belli, *abstinuisse duobus*, *Enee Anthenorique*, et propter quia *vetusti iure hospicii, et pacis, reddendequae Helene semper fuerunt auctores*. Tertiam causam dat Dares Frigius, dicens quod quia suadere non poterant Priamo, ut pacem cum Grecis faceret, prodiderunt civitatem Grecis. Secundo (cum dicit Casibus deinde...) docet, quomodo Anthenor gentem Venetorum condidit et fundavit ... Tercio (cum dicit Enean...) docet ad ea que loca inhabitanda pervenit Eneas cum suis...” Cf. the same commentary segmented into several glosses by Landolfo Colonna in MS Paris, BnF, lat. 5690, fol. 43v: *Expositio Titi Livi*, ed. Crevatin, nos. 4 and 5, 126 f. Both versions may now be easily compared thanks to the digital reproduction of two manuscripts in Gallica: BnF, lat. 5745 (<<http://gallica.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/btv1b9067771m>>) and BnF, lat. 5690 (<<http://gallica.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/btv1b84386221>>), [both Accessed: Aug. 1, 2015].

quod est infra prope finem libri huius antepenultima columna in principio [the reference is to the speech of Titus Manlius Torquatus, where the number of 50, 000 is given].⁵⁹

The frequently quoted glossator D often brings together passages from different parts of the Lombard chronicles he comments upon. His longest gloss, which occupies the entire lower margins of an opening (BAV, Vat. lat. 5001, fols. 47v–48r), provides the most suggestive illustration. A short annotation pointing out the secession of the principality of Salerno in chapter 84b of the *Chronicon Salernitanum* is followed by references both to previous passages of the chronicle where the events leading to the secession are recounted and to subsequent parts of the miscellany containing accounts of important political episodes or information about the territorial extension of the principality. Here, we are dealing with something more than the cross-references or indexes as discussed above. Although this set of glosses may not be termed historiography, it could be called a kind of historical repertory or compendium which might have served as a preparatory work for a history of the principality of Salerno.⁶⁰ Lastly, the French-language translator frequently compares the texts brought together in his miscellany. For example, he adds information taken from Isidore (*Chronicles*, 324, first text of the volume) on the duration of the reign of Diocletian and Maximian to the *Roman History* (IX, 28):

Et toutes uoiez, se cest liure non est falz par coulpe de lo escriptor, ne Eutroppe, qui fu li premier escriptor de cest liure ... ne fait mention quant de temps il fu empereor Dyoclicien et Maximien. Mes Ysidore dit qu'il regna .xx. an. (BnF, fr. 688, fol. 55rb).

The same translator, however, often goes beyond the set of five chronicles *mises en roman* to enrich his texts with information taken

⁵⁹ *Postille di Francesco Petrarca*, ed. Fenzi, no. 278, 293.

⁶⁰ I am only providing a sample here: “Nota hic a quo tempore Salernitani principatum optinuerunt et supra, in principio huius facie collige diuisionem factam inter principatum salernitanum et beneuentanum ... et qui fuerunt illj qui primo tractarunt quod dicta ciuitas aberet dignitatem principatus uide ut supra vj carta [= 42r–v, *Chronicon Salernitanum* 79] ... et fuit principatus salernitanus tempore Gaymarij ualde augmentatus et pene omnes ciuitates Apulie et Kalabrie fuerunt subiugate Salernitanis ut infra xliij^a carta, c. cum pene et xlvj^a .c. dum talia [= 92v and 94r, *Chronicon Salernitanum*, c. 158 and 159]”.

from other sources. The account of the late Republic in book six of the *Historia Romana*, for example, was considerably amplified with summaries of long passages of Lucan's *De bello civili* (see, for example, the metatextual statement introducing such amplifications in VI, 19: "Et en cest capitule uol ie dire un poi de lo dit de Lucaïn de la bataille, laquelle briuelement traite de cest capitule est faite. Et coment en parle lo Lucan...", BnF, fr. 688, fol. 38rb).

Even such a small sample, I believe, proves that expounding the subject matter of historical writings may have either included some elements of critical historical accounts or constituted a leaven for examination of a new historical synthesis. In this sense, commenting verged on writing history. It should also be noted that these sort of literalistic commentaries could go beyond the mere factual dimension of a commented account. Let me first illustrate this phenomenon with some other glosses on the *Chronicon Salernitanum* (BAV, Vat. lat. 5001). From two passages of the chronicle, one concerned with an appointment of Duke Arichis in Benevento, and the other pertaining to a struggle for power in the principality of Salerno, the reader D deduced the evidence for the Lombard princes being elective (a fact which is only implicitly present in the historical narration commented upon):

[Dum dux nomine Liudbrandus fuisset extinctus, una omnes Arichisum principem acclamabant, *Chronicon Salernitanum* 19]: per [sic] mortem Liudbrandi eligitur princeps Archis et sic collige quod issti principes erant per electionem (fol. 14r).

[Cum uero talia patrata fuissent, Daferius quidam, Maionis filius, qui fuerat Guaiferi germanus, omnimodo satagebat una cum collactenaeis suis, quatenus principatum Salernitanum arriperet, *Chronicon Salernitanum* 101]: conlige bene hic quod principatus salernitanus erat per electionem ¶ et reprobatur > Daferio Guayfer <ius> princeps efficitur (fol. 57r).⁶¹

One could say that the glossator used the account of political history, or factual history (*histoire événementielle*), to establish a discourse on the history of institutions. Such a thematic shift is even more frequent in the commentary on the *Liber Pontificalis* by Bohier. From individual papal biographies, he extracted different notions about the history of

⁶¹ The electiveness was also pointed out in the 'compendium' of Salernitan history mentioned above (see the previous note) by a reference to chapter 101: "Item principes salernitani erant per electionem ut infra ix^a carta .c. cum. uero" (fol. 48r).

institutions and offices of the Roman Church, such as the college of cardinals. For example, commenting on the accounts of elections of some early medieval popes, he contrasted the role played by the people of Rome with that of the cardinals, which was developed later. Below are two glosses concerned with this issue, one on the election of Gregory III (731–41), the other on the election of Benedict III (855–8), wrongfully challenged by some cardinals whose identity is not revealed:

[Hunc viri Romani seu omnis populus a magno usque ad parvum ... dum eius decessor de hoc saeculo migrasset, dum ante feretrum in obsequio sui antecessoris esset inventus, subito eum, vi abstrahentes, in pontificatus ordinem elegerunt, *LP* 92 Gregorius III, 292]: Hic habes quod totus populus Romanus elegit papam ante sepulturam defuncti. Non enim erat conclave nec per cardinales tantum fiebat electio.⁶²

[Nam dum esset electus, factione episcoporum Radoaldi Portuensis et Arsenii Hortensis actum est, ut a legatis imperatorum Hludovici et Lotharii cardinales cogitarentur ... Anastasium, quem quartus Leo deposuerat sibi promovere pontificem, *LP* 106 Benedictus III, 588] Hic et supra, c. prox. § fecit, incipiunt cardinales caput aliquanter elevare, saltem in nomine, licet in electione papae totus populus concurrat adhuc, ut patet supra, § Leo et § se. Vide, inquam, supra c. prox. § fecit in verbo: cardinalis. Et patet hic quod episcopus Portuensis vel Ostiensis aut alii episcopi non erant cardinales Romanae ecclesiae nec habebant ius eligendi, sed tantum examinandi et confirmandi electionem. Ad hoc infra, c. clxii § hi omnes in fine, clvi et clviii c. § ii.⁶³

In fact, Bohier and the glossator D researched past phenomena beyond the main concern (if not against the objectives) of the historical account upon which they were commenting.

⁶² Bohier, *Glosse*, 92 (Gregorius III), no. 6, 311.

⁶³ Ibidem, 106 (Benedictus III), no. 18, 423. The references to the paragraph beginning with “fecit” of the previous chapter regard the information on a synode called by Pope Leo IV, where Anastasius, referred to as “cardinalis”, was condemned, and to a long gloss on the very same passage where Bohier discusses different meanings of the term, reasons for introducing the title, and some aspects of the development of this office (inc. “Quia in hoc libro primo hic occurrit nomen hoc: cardinalis, quaeri libet, quid sit cardinalis, unde dicatur, cur non sic extitit nominatus in primaevio statu Ecclesiae sicut fit modo, cur quoque et quando apud ipsos capelli rubei usus fuit”, Bohier, *Glosse*, 105 (Leo IV), no. 52, 417–19).

VI

The commentaries on the subject matter of historical writings discussed so far correspond to the very dimension of historiography, the intrinsic final cause (“*causa finalis intrinseca*”) of which John of Dąbrówka identified as knowledge of deeds done, that is, of history (“*cognitio gestorum*”). However, both medieval history writers and readers or commentators of their writings were often more concerned with the deeper significance of the events represented than with knowledge about them. That ‘hidden’ sense was usually of a moral or edifying character and corresponded, in John’s terms, to the extrinsic final cause (“*causa finalis extrinseca*”) of an historical account. In John’s opinion, the ‘urbanitas’ and ‘eloquentia’ of Vincent’s chronicle will lead readers to abandon ‘vitia’ and follow ‘virtutes’ through which they will be redeemed. The major purpose of Lucan’s *Pharsalia* was instead often said to have been to warn of the dangers of civil wars.⁶⁴

⁶⁴ Ioannes de Dąbrówka, *Commentum, Prologus*, 8–9: “Causa autem finalis intrinseca est cognitio gestorum illustrium principum ac regum Polonie. Extrinseca vero est finis, propter quem quis studet istam Cronicam, ut propter urbanitatem et eloquentiam vel propter scienciam, per quam posset vicia repudiare et amplecti virtutes, per quas valeat devenire in beatitudinem et salutem iuxta illud Psalmi...” NB: the definition of the ‘extrinsic final cause’ appears to have been revised several times and the words ‘vel propter scienciam’ are crossed out in John’s autograph (Warszawa, Biblioteka Narodowa, rkps 3002 III, fol. 37v, I refer to the digital reproduction of the codex in *Polona*, <<http://polona.pl/item/264647/3/>> [Accessed: Aug. 1, 2015]). The distinction between these two objectives had quite a long tradition in reflections upon historical writing, although formulations may have differed. The short anonymous treatise *de historia*, probably written in Late Antiquity and transmitted by the MS Paris, BnF, lat. 7530 (Montecassino, last quarter of the eighth century, Gallica: <<http://gallica.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/btv1b84900617>> [Accessed: Aug. 1, 2015]), defined the first dimension as ‘opus historiae’ and the second as its ‘finis’: “Opus historiae est ut nos notitia rerum instruat, finis autem id est τὸ τέλος ut ex ea sequendas aut fugiendas res cognoscamus aut ad usum eloquentiae adiuuemur” (fol. 205v, ed. Carolus Halm, in *Rhetores latini minores* [Leipzig, 1873], 588). The first to have applied the ‘intrinsic-extrinsic’ distinction of final causes to an historical account was, as far as I know, Zono de’ Magnalis in his fourteenth-century commentary on Lucan’s *Pharsalia*: “Finis operis est duplex, scilicet intrinsecus et extrinsecus. Intrinsecus est cognitio romane ystorie. Extrinsecus est ut uis infortuniis et grauissimo utriusque partis exitu alii ciues hanc utilitatem consequantur et scelere simili restipiscant [*sic restipiscant legatur*] (I am quoting the MS BAV, Vat. lat. 5990, fol. 3va, 14th cent.; contrary to what results from the discussion of this passage by Sanford, ‘The manuscripts of Lucan’, 284, the definition of ‘intrinsic’ and ‘extrinsic’ aims is identical to that in another exemplar of

For this reason, both *De bello civili* and Vincent's *Chronica Polonorum* were seen as pertaining to ethics.⁶⁵ Whether or not an *accessus* identified the superior aim of a particular historical writing, universal patterns, general laws and moral precepts were frequently provided in comments on single passages. The explanation for a Christian defeat at the hands of Muslims given by the anonymous author of the *Chronicon Salernitanum* (c. 126: "iustus iudex dominus minime Christianis uictoriam tribuit eo quod obliuiscerent iusiurandum quod Agarenis iurauerant") was converted by the glossator D into a universally valid rule, according to which oaths sworn to enemies should

the commentary in the MS London, British Library, Add. 18791, fol. 1v; I am grateful to Outi Merisalo for having consulted the latter copy for me; a systematic survey on the whole manuscript tradition is still to be done, for a checklist of manuscripts, see Fabio Stok, 'La "Vita di Virgilio" di Zono de' Magnalis', *Rivista di Cultura Classica e Medioevale*, xxxiii, 2 [1991], 143–81, here: 147, n. 25). The precedent for using those categories to characterise literal and spiritual aspects of a text may be found in the commentaries on the Bible, especially in the early thirteenth century (e.g. by Stephen Langton and Hugh of St Cher), where 'intrinseca' and 'extrinseca' (regarding either 'materia' or 'intentio') describe the spiritual and literal sense respectively (Minnis, *Medieval Theory of Authorship*, 68–71). The terms are thus used in a manner opposite to that of Zono and John. Zono de' Magnalis, born in Florence, flourished in the first half of the fourteenth century. He studied in Bologna and lectured on grammar in Montepulciano. He also authored commentaries on the *Aeneid*, the *Georgics*, and the *Eclogues* (see Mary Louise Lord, 'A commentary on *Aeneid* VI: Ciones de Magnali', *Mediaevalia et Humanistica*, xv [1987], 147–60, and the entry by Giorgio Brugnoli in *Enciclopedia virgiliana*, v,1 [1990], 660–1). Zono's life and writings await a systematic study, despite the rather optimistic remark expressed twenty years ago by A. Teresa Hankey (*Riccobaldo of Ferrara: His Life, Works and Influence* [Roma, 1996], 179): "until recently an undeservedly neglected commentator of the classics". On moral objectives attributed to Lucan's work by other commentators, see Sanford, 'The manuscripts of Lucan', 283–5.

⁶⁵ The question regarding the part of philosophy that a commented text belongs to, which was proper to introductions to philosophers, was adapted by *accessus* to other genres during the Middle Ages. See Ioannes de Dąbrówka, *Commentum, Prologus*, 8: "Subordinatur autem noticia presentis operis parti philosophie ethice seu morali. Propter hoc enim veterum exempla strenua et honesta referuntur, ut posterius ipsorum vestigia insequantur". Among many commentaries on Lucan, see that by Arnulfus of Orléans from the turn of the 12th to the 13th century: "Ethice supponitur, non ideo quod det precepta morum, sed quodam modo inuitat nos ad IIII uirtutes, fortitudinem, prouidentiam, temperanciam, iusticiam, per conuenientes personas, ostendendo bonam moralitatem sicut in Catone et in ceteris bonis ciuibus qui ad politicas uirtutes nituntur que ethice supponuntur" (Arnulfi Aurelianensis *Glosule super Lucanum*, ed. Berthe M. Marti [Roma, 1958], 3).

be kept, even if the latter are not Christians: “Nota ex his et sequentibus jusiurandum hostibus seruandum etiam si non sint Christiani” (BAV, Vat. lat. 5001, fol. 78r).

Admonitions based on an account of a single event might also be strengthened by establishing analogies between the facts related in the text commented upon and some other events. For example, the glossator D deduced from the account in the *Chronicon Salernitanum* of the capture of Emperor Louis II by Prince Adelchis (c. 109) that foreign rulers should not be kept in prison forever; he concluded his remark with a reference to Charles I of Anjou who executed his Staufen rival, Conradinus, shortly after the victory at Tagliacozzo in 1268 (BAV, Vat. lat. 5001, fol. 68r): “Nota consilium huius sagacis Saraceni de non tenendo in carcere per<pe>tuo aliquo principe alterius nationis quod optime fecit Kar<olus> in persona Conradini”. Interesting evidence of such an attitude may also be found in John of Dąbrówka’s commentary on Vincent’s chronicle. It must be noted that in his work Vincent had already provided moral, juridical, or philosophical explanations for subsequent episodes of Polish history, particularly through the words of Archbishop Jan (John). In fact, three of the four books of the chronicle consist of a dialogue between Mateusz (Matthew, traditionally identified with the homonymous bishop of Cracow, 1144–66), who deploys an historical account, and Jan (presented as the archbishop of Gniezno, to be identified with Janik, who held that see from 1149 until his death between 1168 and 1176), who comments upon it.⁶⁶ In his replies he makes extensive use of historical analogies. The fifteenth-century commentator was well aware of the role played by the archbishop (often presented as the one who ‘confirms’ or ‘proves’ Mateusz’s account⁶⁷). When commenting on Jan’s speeches, the commentator sometimes reinforced this dimension by establishing other analogies. In Vincent’s chronicle, the account of a battle between Poles and Ruthenians, which started with an insulting message sent by the Ruthenian chief and ended with the Polish ruler’s victory, is followed by Archbishop Jan’s statement

⁶⁶ For more on the functions of dialogue in the *Chronicle*, see Edward Skibiński, ‘Dialog w “Kronice Mistrza Wincentego”’, *Symbolae Philologorum Posnaniensium Graecae et Latinae*, 7 (1988), 129–41.

⁶⁷ See, for example, Ioannes de Dąbrówka, *Commentum*, II, 4, p. 60: “confirmat per exempla naturalia ac similitudines familiares nec non et alia gesta similia intendens tantum”.

that arrogance led many to downfall (“ceruicosus arrogantie tumor qui multos subvertit”, II, 13).⁶⁸ This lesson is exemplified by the fate of Darius, defeated by Alexander the Great after having challenged him with a disrespectful letter. John of Dąbrówka, in his turn, first defined the subject of the Archbishop’s speech and summarized the story of Darius and Alexander, and then reported a well-known episode preceding the recent battle of Tannenberg:

Similiter accidit inter regem Polonie Wladislaum et Cruciferos de Prussia anno Domini M^oCCC^oX. Cruciferi enim superbia afflati Wladislao regi Polonie cum Alexandro, alias Vitoldo, magno duce Lithwanie, fratre suo, duos gladios cruentos ante congressum direxerunt, quibus ipsos necare intenderunt. Ipsi vero humiliter acceptis gladiis in auxilium Deo assumpto magistrum generalem cum marsalcone ac commendatoribus nec non aliis ipsorum complicibus centum milia XXX^a milia et quadringeta occiderent. Quorum residui capti Cracouiam funibus vincti ac catenis ligati non pauci sunt appulsi vinculaque grandia ipsimet sustulerunt, quibus Polonos trucidare voluerunt.

John rounded off his commentary on this epistle with a short catalogue of biblical figures who had perished due to arrogance, followed by theological reflection on ‘superbia’.⁶⁹ This sort of commentary, whether based only on the facts related in the text commented upon or supported by events known from other sources, made historical writings repositories of cases, or *exempla*, to be used either for theoretical reflection, especially of ethical character, or for more practically oriented disquisitions on political, social or ecclesiastical matters, often expressed by means of advice and warning. Let me add some of Bohier’s other glosses into the handful of commentaries of the type discussed above. A very careful reader of papal biographies, he managed to capture the historical dimension of the papacy, providing throughout his glosses a kind of institutional history of the Roman Church, as already shown by his remarks on the cardinals quoted above. However, his effort of ‘cognitio gestorum’ is ultimately subjected to juridical and ecclesiological interpretation. More precisely

⁶⁸ *Magistri Vincentii dicti Kadlubek, Chronica Polonorum*, ed. Marian Plezia (MPH, S.N., 11, Kraków, 1994), 43 f.

⁶⁹ Ioannes de Dąbrówka, *Commentum*, II, 14, p. 76 f. This fragment is also discussed by Olszewski, ‘History at the medieval university?’, within considerations on John’s theory of virtues and vices.

still, in Bohier's commentary the *Liber Pontificalis* becomes a means of criticism and a source of canon law, while the glosses themselves serve to work out a solution for the schism.⁷⁰ Arguing for essential equality among bishops, and against the pope's claim to universal jurisdiction, Bohier suggested that the double election of the bishop of Rome in 1378 should be healed by a synod of the Roman ecclesiastical province. He deployed this project by assiduously commenting on the local synods held in Rome throughout the previous centuries. A gloss on calling such a synod in order to examine the accusation against Pope Sixtus III (432–40)⁷¹ is a good illustration both of a close relationship and of differences (or hierarchies) between the two kinds of exegesis conducted by Bohier, i.e. historico-antiquarian and juridico-ecclesiological. A short summary of the episode is followed by a long discussion (enriched by a number of references to other lives of the *Liber* and to the canons) of issues pertaining to the authority of provincial synods (the deposition and reinstatement of bishops, disciplinary issues concerning clergymen, accusations of heresy) and those reserved for ecumenical synods (heresies supported by many, and thus dangerous for many ecclesiastical communities). Bohier, again providing evidence from both the *Liber* and the canons, also points out that the eight ecumenical synods ("VIII concilia generalia et magna") were called by emperors. In this way, the commentator goes well beyond the single event in Sixtus' pontificate. His generalisation is of a historical nature: from comparable situations that recurred under different popes, Bohier draws conclusions about rules observed in the Church in earlier times. Ultimately, however, these rules are set against the situation of his time:

Modo tamen propter discordiam assumptorum in Romana ecclesia petitur fieri concilium generale. Quod enim bona fide petitur ab illis qui putant Romanum episcopum universalem seu generalem omnium patriarcham, contra id quod habetur xcix di, nullus et c. se. [=Gratiani, pars I, dist. 99, canon 4].⁷²

⁷⁰ Cf. the dedication to Charles V: "Quae, inquam, addita meque ac mea dicta singula correctioni catholicae matris nostrae Ecclesiae humiliter subicio et inclitis-simae tuae etiam maiestatis" (Bohier, *Glosse*, 2f).

⁷¹ "Hic post annum unum et menses VIII incriminatus est a quodam Basso. Hoc audiens Valentinianus Augustus, iussit concilium sancte synodi congregari" (LP 46, 101).

⁷² Bohier, *Glosse*, 46 (Xystus III), no. 2, 123–5.

As a further consequence, the knowledge of ancient rules acquired a normative value in Bohier's commentary. This is proven by a gloss on a double election following Pope Liberius's death (366). The mention of this controversy, compared to a passage from the life of Liberius, allowed Bohier to conclude that an ordinary synod was competent enough to deal with a double election. But this was only a starting point for a critique of modern claims to examine the schism at an ecumenical council:

[Et cum eodem ordinatur sub intentione Ursinus; et facto concilio sacerdotum, constituerunt Damasum, *LP* 39 (*Damasus*), p. 85] Nota in concilio, et [etiam *Barb. lat.* 584, fol. 19va] non generali, duplicem et discordem papae electionem declarari; sic supra, c. Liberius [= *Glosse* 37, no. 8, p. 101 f.: Nota hic quod in electionibus fiendis, in presbyterorum criminibus puniendis et in similibus actibus Romanus episcopus, ut alter metropolitanus, adunabat episcoporum concilium. Sic infra, c. l et liii § eodem, cum similibus]. Cur igitur modo postulatur a quibusdam generale concilium? Quidam dicunt eo quod tunc particularis Romana ecclesia censebatur sicut alia patriarchalis ecclesia, ar. lxxv di, mos antiquus [= *Decretum Gratiani*, pars I, dist. 65, canon 6] et xcix di, ecce [= *Decretum Gratiani*, pars I, dist. 99, canon 5]. Tunc enim ipsa in causis tantum orthodoxae fidei tenebat principatum, xxiii, q.i. haec est fides et c. [= *Decretum Gratiani*, pars II, causa 24, quaestio 1, canon 14] non turbatur cum similibus. Nunc vero, quia totam christianitatem ac mundum amplecti videtur, in omnibus concilium omnium postulatur, ut quod omnes tangit ab omnibus comprobetur, ar. xxiii di, c.i. [= *Gratiani*, pars I, dist. 23, canon 1], lxiii di, vota [= *Gratiani*, pars I, dist. 63, canon 27?] et viii, q.i. licet [= *Decretum Gratiani*, pars II, causa 8, quaestio 1, canon 15].⁷³

VII

Glosses on language, discussed at the very beginning of this paper, and parenetic or normative commentaries, examined in the last paragraphs, both allowed readers to overs the particular dimension of the historical narration and – by considering an account of singular events as exemplary with regard to some general phenomena, either linguistic or philosophical – granted it an almost 'scientific' status (in the Aristotelian sense of the term). In this way, historical writing became if not an *ars* proper, at least an *appendens* of the arts, of grammar and rhetoric on the one hand, and of ethics on the

⁷³ *Ibidem*, 39 (*Damasus*), no. 2, 105 f.

other.⁷⁴ It must be added that the moral reading of historical writings not only provided material for theoretical (ethical, political) reflection, but also met, especially in the Late Middle Ages, the increasing needs of preaching, which abundantly used historical *exempla*.⁷⁵ One might be struck by the distance between such an approach and the modern concept of scholarly history as developed by the nineteenth century, which focused primarily, if not exclusively, on the cognition of the past and the specificity of single events.⁷⁶ However, the relationship between medieval and late modern ways of studying and writing history cannot be reduced to that divergence. The topos of *historia magistra* was neither abandoned during the early modern times,⁷⁷ nor

⁷⁴ In addition to works quoted above in n. 4 on the place of history in the medieval classifications of knowledge, see the articles by Juliusz Domański, 'Arys-totelesowski paradygmat nauki a historia: dwa przykłady z XIII wieku', *Przegląd Tomistyczny*, viii (2000), 287–300; and, 'Pomocnica nauk i teologii: kilka wątków metanaukowej refleksji nad historią w XII wieku', *Przegląd Tomistyczny*, ix (2003), 57–112. Cf. Olszewski, 'History at the medieval university?' on John of Dąbrówka's more complex and original idea of history being scientific.

⁷⁵ See Michael Menzel, *Predigt und Geschichte. Historische Exempel in der geistlichen Rhetorik des Mittelalters* (Köln, 1998). The remarkable fortune of Valerius Maximus during the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries (see Schullian, 'Valerius Maximus', and Lechat, 'Valère Maxime au miroir de Simon de Hesdin', 31–3) is also significant for the exemplaristic approach to historical writings. His *Facta et dicta memorabilia* were read as either a work of Roman history (to be conferred with histories proper, see, e.g., *Postille di Francesco Petrarca*, ed. Fenzi, nos. 29, 106; Paolo de Bernardo's on the same, Lazzarini, *Paolo de Bernardo*, 228–32; and the glosses by Gasperino Barzizza on Livy and *Periochae*, see Lepore, 'Postille petrarchesche'; cf. the glosses by Dionigi da Borgo San Sepolcro on Valerius Maximus in above n. 52, and those by Giovanni Cavallini on both Livy and Valerius, see Schullian, 'Valerius Maximus', 334–7; Petoletti, 'Nota pro consilio', 51 f., 65), or as a reservoir of *exempla*. The reader D, for instance, referred to Valerius (IV, 3, 1), when comparing the chastity of a Moslem chief (as narrated in the *Chronicon Salernitanum*, 108) to that of Scipio Africanus the Elder: "Nota hic de mirabili castitate huius Sagan Saraceno, qui abens filiam principis Beneuentani obsidem eam intactam seruauit et patri resstituit. Sic Scipio agens annum xx^m sue etatis capiens uicta Kartagine uxorem Indibilis ipsam intactam ac uirginem eidem licet hosti resstituit, ut narrat Maximus Valerius" (BAV, Vat. lat. 5001, fol. 67v).

⁷⁶ Cf. Paul Veyne, *Comment on écrit l'histoire, suivi de Foucault révolutionne l'histoire* (Paris, 1978), 43–54; François Hartog, *Régimes d'historicité. Présentisme et expériences du temps* (2nd edn. Paris, 2012), 145 f., 182–7.

⁷⁷ It was even boosted by the humanists, who regarded history as philosophy teaching by examples, cf. Rüdiger Landfester, *Historia magistra vitae. Untersuchungen zur humanistischen Geschichtstheorie des 14. bis 16. Jahrhunderts* (Genève, 1972).

was edifying reading necessarily the most important one in the Middle Ages. In fact, integrating medieval and early modern commentaries and glosses into the global history of historical writing would, in my opinion, be of great importance for capturing the variety of social approaches towards historiography. Here, I shall confine myself to just one remark. For research on the origins of the modern historical method, the comments on the subject matter having *cognitio gestorum* as their aim are of particular interest. Expounding technical terms or the historical content of entire passages required an investigation into different dimensions of the past as represented in the text. It may also have led to highlighting aspects only marginally dealt with or implicitly present in the text commented upon. This thematic shift may be partly described through distinction between historiography and antiquarian writings, a distinction the ancient origins of which have been documented, among others, by Arnaldo Momigliano. As early as classical Greece, historiography was confined to chronologically arranged narrations of political events, while systematic discussions of the history of religion, laws, institutions, as well as genealogies and biographies, were considered writings of another type, namely antiquarian. In Momigliano's view, the separation between these two branches was only gradually overcome in modern times, with the exception of some moments of generic incertitude or rare texts combining features of the both.⁷⁸ Yet, as proven by the evidence provided

On the long persistence and late dissolution of this topos see Reinhart Koselleck, 'Historia magistra vitae. The Dissolution of the Topos into the Perspective of a Modernized Historical Process', in *idem*, *Futures Past: On the Semantics of Historical Time*, trans. Keith Tribe (New York, 2004); Hartog, *Régimes*, 97–133, 144–9.

⁷⁸ Momigliano investigated this phenomenon in various studies from the end of the 1930s onwards. The most complete discussion is probably to be found in the "Sather Classical Lectures" given at Berkeley in the academic year 1961–2 and published posthumously as *The Classical Foundations of Modern Historiography* (Berkeley–Los Angeles, Oxford, 1990); see esp. 'The Herodotean and the Thucydidean Tradition' (29–53) and 'The Rise of Antiquarian Research' (54–79). According to Momigliano, the moment when Classical distinctions between historical genres weakened to a point was in the Late Antiquity (see *idem*, 'L'età del trapasso fra storiografia antica e storiografia medievale [320–550 d.C.]', *Rivista Storica Italiana*, lxxxi [1969], 286–303), while the particular genre which had combined the historiographical and antiquarian methods was ecclesiastical history, particularly in its origins and during its renewal in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries (see *idem*, 'The Origins of Ecclesiastical Historiography', in *The Classical Foundations*, 132–52). Though some of his views have been challenged, the essence

above, at least some medieval readers and commentators were willing to establish 'antiquarian' discourses starting from an historiographical account.⁷⁹ Thus, medieval commentaries and glosses may be considered a place where historiography and antiquarian research met before early modern erudition offered greater opportunities for the two branches to converge. Even when a commentary did not go far beyond the subject of the commented text, explaining historical matter may have led to some critical processes (such as confronting different accounts of the same event) and presented an opening towards historical synthesis. In short, commenting on the historical content of historical writings provided an opportunity to establish more complete historical knowledge and stimulated the 'discovering of past as past' (to adopt a felicitous formula used by Beryl Smalley in reference to the humanists).⁸⁰ It is up to future, more detailed

of the distinction between the antiquarian and the historian has not been criticised. See, e.g., Tim J. Cornell, 'Ancient History and the Antiquarian Revisited: Some Thoughts on Reading Momigliano's Classical Foundations', in Michael H. Crawford and Christopher R. Ligota (eds.), *Ancient History and the Antiquarian: Essays in memory of Arnaldo Momigliano* (London, 1995), 1–14; Christopher R. Ligota, 'From Philology to History: Ancient Historiography between Humanism and Enlightenment', *ibidem*, 105–15; Benedetto Bravo, 'Critice in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries and the Rise of the Notion of Historical Criticism', in Christopher R. Ligota and Jean-Louis Quantin (eds.), *History of Scholarship: A Selection of Papers from the Seminar on the History of Scholarship Held Annually at the Warburg Institute* (Oxford, 2006), 135–95; Peter N. Miller (ed.), *Momigliano and Antiquarianism: Foundations of the Modern Cultural Sciences*, (Toronto, 2007). The question of the medieval 'gap' in the history of relations between historiography and antiquarian approaches, however, has not been raised, with perhaps two recent exceptions: Carla Dionisotti, 'Momigliano and the Medieval Boundary', in Tim Cornell and Oswyn Murray (eds.), *The Legacy of Arnaldo Momigliano* (London and Turin, 2014), 1–11; Anthony Grafton, 'Arnaldo Momigliano and the Tradition of Ecclesiastical History', *ibidem*, 53–76, here: 65–7 (with a proposal to antedate the revival of church history to the decades preceding the beginning of the Reformation).

⁷⁹ The mechanism of thematic shift itself was proper to the scholastic lecture, which often led to extracting new problems from the work read and commented on. These problems would then, in turn, become subjects to separate *quaestiones* (cf. Holtz, *Glosse e commenti*, 71). It is significant, however, that in comments on historical writings it may have led to investigating aspects of the past which historiography did not traditionally deal with. Cf. remarks on the analogous practice by seventeenth century erudites in Krzysztof Pomian, *Przeszłość jako źródło wiedzy* (Warszawa, 2010), 444 f.

⁸⁰ Smalley, *Historians*, 392 f; see also *eadem*, *English Friars*, 292–8.

studies to verify the impact of medieval glosses and commentaries on the early modern learned *milieux* where critical historical methods were worked out. That there may have been some impact is suggested by the fact that some of the historical manuscripts discussed above were known, or even belonged, to scholars of that time. Consequently, careful research into the modern history of medieval historical manuscripts containing commentaries should be one of the ways to test this hypothesis.⁸¹

The commentaries and *corpora* of glosses examined above show that historical and antiquarian readings did not exclude philological, rhetorical or moral comments on historical writing (and vice versa). Often, they all occurred within one and the same apparatus. However, one might have the impression that, from the fourteenth century onwards, the historical dimension attracted more attention than in previous centuries⁸². Investigating the relationship between different kinds of reading and the different objectives of readers – in the same commentary, on the one hand, and between different commentaries, on the other, both synchronically and diachronically – is another perspective worth developing. This, however, will be impossible without heuristic progress. While carrying out surveys on medieval commentaries and

⁸¹ The MS BnF, fr. 688, e.g., passed through the hands of Nicolas Claude de Peiresc, who provided François Duchesne with a copy of a fragment in 1612. The MS BAV, Vat. lat. 5001, instead, attracted much attention from Italian scholars between the sixteenth and eighteenth centuries, as proven by a number of modern copies, some of them including the medieval apparatus as well, see Kujawiński, 'Commentare storici'.

⁸² Cf. Smalley, *Historians*, 392 f. This may have been encouraged by the valorisation of the literal sense of the Bible first by the Victorines in the twelfth and then by the leading exegetes of the 13th and early 14th cc. (see, e.g., Smalley, *The Study of the Bible in the Middle Ages* (Oxford, 1952), 214–42; Ambrogio Piazzoni, 'Esegesi e storiografia in Ugo di San Vittore', in Claudio Leonardi (ed.), *Gli umanesimi medievali. Atti del II Congresso dell' "Internationale Mittellateinerkomitee"*, Firenze, Certosa del Galluzzo, 11–15 settembre 1993 (Firenze, 1998), 491–500; Alastair J. Minnis, 'Preface to the Reissued Second Edition', in *Medieval Theory of Authorship*, IX–XIII. To quote but one significant example of an exegete, history writer and history commentator: Trevet defined his commentary on the Psalms (1317–20) as "expositio litteralis et historica" in contrast to the old commentaries which focused on allegorical interpretation (in the dedication to John of Bristol, as quoted by Crevatin, *Dalle fabulae alle historiae*, 77, on this commentary see Smalley, *The Study of the Bible*, 346 f. and 351 f., and Minnis, *Medieval Theory of Authorship*, 85 f.).

glosses on classical historians, a corpus of apparatus pertaining to late antique and medieval historical writings still needs to be established. This operation should be followed by in-depth studies of every single piece of commentary, with particular attention on the social and intellectual environment in which they originated and circulated, their purpose, and their sources (including the possibility of one apparatus deriving from another). The present survey only skimmed over all these aspects. These are, in my opinion, the most urgent tasks for the future research on medieval commenting on historical writings.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary sources

Manuscripts

- Città del Vaticano, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Barb. lat. 148.
 Città del Vaticano, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Ottob. lat. 3291.
 Città del Vaticano, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Reg. lat. 763.
 Città del Vaticano, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Vat. lat. 1860.
 Città del Vaticano, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Vat. lat. 1924.
 Città del Vaticano, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Vat. lat. 1974.
 Città del Vaticano, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Vat. lat. 5001.
 Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, fr. 688.
 Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, lat. 2321.
 Wien, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, 580.

Published primary sources

- Dąbrowka Ioannes de, *Commentum in Chronicam Polonorum magistri Vincentii dicti Kadłubek*, ed. Marianus Zwiercan, adiuvantibus Anna Sophia Kozłowska et Michael Rzepliński (Monumenta Poloniae Historica, n.s., XIV, Cracoviae, 2008).
Liber Pontificalis nella recensione di Pietro Guglielmo OSB e del card. Pandolfo, glossato da Pietro Bohier OSB, vescovo d'Orvieto. Introduzione, testo, indici, ed. Ulderico Přerovský, t. I: *Introduzione. Indici*, Studia Gratiana 21; t. II: *Liber Pontificalis*, Studia Gratiana 22; t. III: *Glosse*, Studia Gratiana 23 (Roma, 1978).
 Trevet Nikolaus, *Apparatus libri Titi Livi I.1–7.3 in Titus Livius, Ab Urbe condita I, 1–9. Ein mittellateinischer Kommentar und sechs romanische Übersetzungen und Kürzungen aus dem Mittelalter*, ed. Curt J. Wittlin (Tübingen, 1970), 2–27.

Secondary literature

- Catalogus Translationum et Commentariorum. Mediaeval and Renaissance Latin Translations and Commentaries*, t. 1–2, ed. Paul O. Kristeller; t. 3–6, ed. F. Edward Kranz; t. 7–9, ed. Virginia Brown (Washington D.C., 1961–2011), t. 10, ed. Greta Dinkova-Bruun (Toronto, 2014).

- Ciccuto Marcello, Crevatin Giuliana, and Fenzi Enrico (eds.), *Reliquiarum servator. Il manoscritto Parigino latino 5690 e la storia di Roma nel Livio dei Colonna e di Francesco Petrarca* (Pisa, 2012).
- Guenée Bernard, *Histoire et culture historique dans l'occident médiéval* (Paris, 1980).
- Holtz Louis, 'Glosse e commenti', in: Guglielmo Cavallo, Claudio Leonardi, and Ernesto Menestò (eds.), *Lo spazio letterario del Medioevo*, 1. *Il Medioevo latino*, vol. III. *La ricezione del testo* (Roma, 1995), 59–111.
- Kujawiński Jakub, 'Commentare storici nell'Italia meridionale del XIV secolo. Intorno alle glosse presenti nel ms. BAV, Vat. lat. 5001', in Lidia Capo and Antonio Ciaralli (eds.), *Per ricordare Enzo. Atti della giornata di studio in memoria di Vincenzo Matera, Roma, 4 maggio 2012, Università "La Sapienza"* (Reti Medievali E-Book, 25, Firenze, 2015), 129–67.
- Minnis Alastair J., *Medieval Theory of Authorship. Scholastic Literary Attitudes in the Later Middle Ages*. Second Edition with a New Preface by the Author (Philadelphia, 2010).
- Olsen Birger Munk, *L'étude des auteurs classiques latins aux XIe et XIIe siècles*, t. IV, 1 *La réception de la littérature classique. Travaux philologiques* (Paris, 2009); t. IV, 2 *La réception de la littérature classique. Manuscrits et textes* (Paris, 2014).
- Petoletti Marco, 'Nota pro consilio Polistorie mee orationem predictam. Giovanni Cavallini lettore di Livio', *Italia Medioevale e Umanistica*, xxxix (1996), 47–76.
- Powitz Gerhardt, 'Textus cum commento', *Codices manuscripti*, v (1979), 80–9.
- Sanford Eva M., 'The manuscripts of Lucan: Accesus and Marginalia', *Speculum*, ix, 3 (1934), 278–95.
- Smalley Beryl, *English Friars and Antiquity in the Early Fourteenth Century* (Oxford, 1960).
- Smalley Beryl, *Historians in the Middle Ages* (London, 1974).
- Zwiercan Marian, *Komentarz Jana z Dąbrówki do Kroniki Mistrza Wincentego zwanego Kadłubkiem* (Wrocław, 1969).

Jakub Kujawiński – medieval history; assistant professor at the Institute of History, Adam Mickiewicz University, Poznań, postdoctoral researcher at the Department of Languages University of Jyväskylä; e-mail: jakub.kujawinski@gmail.com